

ment ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TAGUE: Telegrams relative to the proposed revenue bill (H. R. 12863) now in conference; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STINESS: Petition of John Mitchell Literary Association, of Providence, R. I., favoring passage of legislation endorsing self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: Petition of Ellen Lodge, No. 420, International Association of Machinists, of New Haven, Conn., favoring extension of Government control over industries to ensure Federal Wage Board wages; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of Minot Association of Commerce, Minot, N. Dak., urging the deportation and debarment of all enemy aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 6, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou hast given to us a voice in the council of the nations. We come before Thee that we may have the grace to justify the position in which Thou hast placed us in Thy providence. We pray that every thought may be subjected to the will of God; that every purpose that we have as a Nation may take in the divine program; that we may labor together with God for the establishment of that order which Thou hast ordained shall come into the earth. Bless us this day in the discharge of the sacred and holy duties of this office. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House further insists upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13274) to provide relief where formal contracts have been made in the manner required by law, agrees to the further conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. DENT, Mr. FIELDS, and Mr. KAHN managers at the conference on the part of the House.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I present a joint resolution adopted by the Wisconsin Legislature, which I ask to have read.

The resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Joint resolution 14.

A joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to cooperate with the Dominion of Canada in the enlarged canalization of the St. Lawrence River for the passage of ocean-going vessels into the Great Lakes.

Whereas the Dominion of Canada has provided for the improvement of the Welland Canal, connecting Lake Ontario and Lake Erie, so that such canal will accommodate ships of 25-foot draft, 800-foot length, and 80-foot width, work on which improvement was suspended during the war and is now again being taken up and will be completed in the near future;

Whereas the St. Lawrence River between Montreal and Lake Ontario can not be used by vessels of over 14-foot draft and 270-foot length; and

Whereas it is deemed to be a matter of great and vital importance to the United States that the St. Lawrence River be so improved that larger vessels may be accommodated and may move between the Great Lakes and the ocean: Now therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the assembly concurring), That we earnestly and urgently petition the Congress of the United States to take such steps as may be deemed best and most expeditious looking to the early improvement of the St. Lawrence River by joint arrangement with the Dominion of Canada.

Resolved further, That a copy of this resolution, duly attested by the signatures of the presiding officers and chief clerks of the two houses, shall be transmitted to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives in Congress from this State.

RILEY S. YOUNG,
Speaker of the Assembly.
C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
EDWARD F. DITTMAR,
President of the Senate.
D. G. MUNSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

Mr. NEW. I send to the desk and ask that there be printed in the RECORD a series of resolutions adopted at a meeting of the Indianapolis Branch of the American Protective League. The resolutions discuss the future treatment of all alien enemies

now in prison in this country and restrictive legislation as to future immigration.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Immigration and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolved by the Indianapolis Branch of the American Protective League (numbering about 1,000 citizens of this community who have served the United States Government throughout the war through the Department of Justice), That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby earnestly urged to take such steps as lay within its power to cause all alien enemies who have been interned during the war just ended to be deported to the respective countries from which they came at the earliest practicable time; and

Resolved further, That the Congress of the United States be, and it is hereby earnestly urged to enact such restrictive legislation as to future immigration as will make it certain that should the misfortune of another foreign war come upon the country its citizenship shall not be honeycombed with disloyal enemy propagandists, as it has been during this war; and

Resolved further, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted to the junior Senator from Indiana and to the Representative in Congress from this congressional district, with the request that they be spread upon the records of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

The resolution of which the foregoing is a true copy was passed at a meeting of the Indianapolis branch of the American Protective League held February 1, 1919.

SAMUEL D. MILLER,
Chairman of the Executive Committee.

FEBRUARY 3, 1919.

Mr. GRONNA. I send to the desk a brief letter with resolutions from the Board of Agriculture of the State of Pennsylvania, which I ask to have read.

There being no objection, the resolutions were read, as follows:

FEBRUARY 4, 1919.

HON. ASLE J. GRONNA,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: I am inclosing herewith copy of resolution adopted by the Pennsylvania State Board of Agriculture at their annual meeting held in this city on January 22 last.

Yours, very truly,

FRED RASMUSSEN,
Secretary of Agriculture.

Report of committee on resolutions.

Whereas many of the destitute people of Europe are suffering for want of food and are looking to America for sustenance until their 1919 crops mature; and

Whereas many of our farms have not produced maximum crops because of the lack of sufficient experienced farm laborers, and as the same condition will prevail the coming year unless it is definitely known within a short time when the farm laborers serving in the United States Army will return, so that proper arrangements and plans can be made for the coming year's crops: Therefore be it

Resolved by the State board of agriculture, in session at Harrisburg, Pa., this 22d day of January, A. D. 1919, That the authorities at Washington be informed of the seriousness of the situation, so that legislation or regulations be adopted placing farm laborers in the most essential class and steps taken for their immediate discharge of all such men serving in the Army at home and abroad.

Whereas in the great readjustment that will take place shortly in the economic conditions of all classes of life it is important that the labor standards and prices of commodities be kept at a parity so that the farmer's portion thereof be just and equitable: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we are opposed to any of the proposed schemes of land grants and Government-aided farmers, because we believe there is a grave danger of the same disastrous results which took place after the War of the Rebellion, when the Government stimulated increased farms and would-be farmers caused such an overproduction of farm products that prices of farm crops were below cost of production, corn becoming cheaper than coal was used for fuel, this violation of the unchangeable laws of supply and demand causing deprivation, misery, and the failure which overwhelmed the farmers of the East and West, and in addition causing the depletion of the soil fertility to much land throughout the great West that is beyond redemption.

Whereas the results of our war activities have shown that much of the waste of time, treasure, and life has been caused by our unpreparedness and our mistaken sense of security through our supposed isolation and material prosperity: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we are in favor of a system of universal military training similar to that known as the Swiss.

JOHN A. WOODWARD,
DORIS L. FULKMAN,
J. N. GLOVER,
NORRIS G. TEMPLE,
A. C. CREAMY,
Committee.

Mr. GRONNA presented a memorial of the Association of Commerce of Minot, N. Dak., remonstrating against the return to the United States of Germans and Austrians who formerly lived in this country, and praying for the deportation of all enemy aliens now interned here, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented a petition of sundry ministers of the Reformed Church of America, praying for the independence of Armenia, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Commodore Barry Council, No. 533, Knights of Columbus, of Brooklyn, N. Y., praying for

the freedom of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of James River Lodge, No. 322, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, of Jamestown, N. Dak., and a petition of Local Lodge No. 2, International Association of Machinists, of Devils Lake, N. Dak., praying for Government ownership of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 789, International Association of Machinists, of Grand Forks, N. Dak., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the bill providing for Government control of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Northwestern Lumbermen's Association, in convention at Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the return to private ownership of the railroads of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I send to the desk and ask to have read a resolution adopted by the House and Senate of the Michigan Legislature with reference to good roads, which I ask to have read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

MICHIGAN STATE SENATE,
Lansing, February 4, 1919.

Hon. CHARLES E. TOWNSEND,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have the honor to advise you that the Senate and House of Representatives of Michigan have adopted the following concurrent resolution:

Indorsing pending legislation in Congress providing for appropriations for Federal aid in highway building.

Whereas the Committee on Post Roads and Post Offices of the United States Senate has reported favorably on the so-called Bankhead bill, carrying an appropriation of \$200,000,000 for Federal aid in highway building, to be apportioned among the several States; and

Whereas said appropriation would aid Michigan to the extent of nearly \$5,500,000 in the building of highways: Therefore

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the United States Senators and Representatives from Michigan be, and are hereby, requested to give this measure their hearty support; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded to each Senator and Representative in Congress from this State.

Yours, truly,

DENIS E. ALWARD,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I also send to the desk and ask to have read a resolution adopted by the senate of the Legislature of Michigan relative to the suffrage amendment, which I ask to have read.

The resolution was read, as follows:

SENATE, STATE OF MICHIGAN,
Lansing, Mich., January 2, 1919.

Hon. CHARLES E. TOWNSEND,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a resolution this day adopted by the senate of the State of Michigan, as follows:

"Senate resolution No. 17.

"Whereas an amendment to the Federal Constitution providing that 'the right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged in the United States or any State on account of sex' has passed the House of Representatives and is now pending in the Senate; and

"Whereas during the war, in recognition of the value of woman's war service the Parliaments of Great Britain and Canada enfranchised the women of those countries, and those of France and Italy have virtually promised the same act of political justice; and

"Whereas immediately after signing of armistice autocratic Germany and Hungary gave women the ballot; and

"Whereas in our own country women vote on same terms as men in 15 States and have some voting rights in 20 others, laboriously acquired during a struggle of 40 years; and

"Whereas the electors of Michigan defeated woman suffrage five years ago by 98,000 votes; two months ago it carried by nearly 35,000 votes, an indication of the great change in sentiment throughout the State; and

"Whereas the leaders of all political parties, major and minor, have demanded the passage of this amendment and the national committees of the major political parties have earnestly indorsed it: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we the members of the Michigan senate, in recognition of the justice of women's demands and of their contribution to society in war and in peace, hereby call upon the Senate of the United States to pass the woman suffrage amendment and give the States opportunity to ratify the same."

Very respectfully,

DENNIS E. ALWARD,
Secretary of the Senate.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Waterville, Me., praying for Government ownership of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. BORAH. I present a joint memorial from the Legislature of the State of Idaho with reference to the so-called Susan B. Anthony suffrage amendment to the Constitution. I understand that my colleague [Mr. NUGENT] on yesterday had a similar memorial read to the Senate, so it is unnecessary for me

to read this one. I ask, however, that it be referred to the Committee on Woman Suffrage.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the memorial will be so referred.

Mr. CURTIS. I have here a telegram from the governor of Kansas, showing the action of the Kansas Legislature in regard to the pending proposal for the Government to aid in the construction of highways, which I desire to have read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:

TOPEKA, KANS., January 29, 1919.

Senator CHARLES CURTIS,
Washington, D. C.:

Kansas Legislature to-day adopted resolution requesting Congress to pass bill granting additional Federal aid for construction of highways. This is vital to the plans for immediate employment of returning soldiers.

HENRY J. ALLEN, Governor.

TAX ON FRUIT AND BERRY JUICES.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I understand the conference report on the revenue bill has not yet been presented. I do not know whether it has been agreed upon or not; but I have a resolution from the legislature of my State with reference to one question involved in that bill, which is among the questions being considered by the conference committee. Being a memorial from the legislature, I ask that it may be read. I do not understand that there is any way of referring matters of this kind to the conference committee, but in this way I can bring it to their attention.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 13.

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States an act "to provide revenue, and for other purposes," commonly known as the 1918 revenue bill; that section 68 of this bill as passed by the House of Representatives contained a provision in section 628 thereof authorizing the collection of a tax of 20 per cent of the selling price on all fruit and berry juices produced in the United States, according to a ruling of the Treasury Department of the United States in construing a similar provision in the revenue act of October 4, 1917; and Whereas said provision of the bill was amended by the Senate of the United States so as to exempt from the operation thereof fruit and berry juices, and afterwards passed by said body as amended; and

Whereas a conference committee appointed by each House of Congress is now considering the amendment as adopted by the United States Senate, and according to information received by the manufacturers of grape, loganberry, and apple juices in this State intends to submit a report to each House of Congress recommending that the bill be amended so as to impose a tax of 10 per cent of the selling price of such fruit and berry juices; and

Whereas the imposition of such a tax would render valueless great manufacturing industries which have been built up in the States of Oregon, Washington, and elsewhere at a cost of vast sums of money; and

Whereas a large portion of the most fertile agricultural land in the Northwest is now devoted to the growth and culture of grapes, loganberries, and apples, which are manufactured into grape, loganberry, and apple juices, thereby giving permanent employment to thousands of our citizens, which could not continue under the burdens of such tax; and

Whereas the taxation of the grape, loganberry, and apple juices as contemplated by said revenue bill, and the consequent destruction of our manufacturing and agricultural industries, would deprive this State of giving employment to the returning soldiers, sailors, and marines now in the service of their country; and

Whereas grape, loganberry, and apple juices as manufactured in the Northwest are food products rather than beverages and thereby should not be classified with synthetic concoctions, such as root beer, ginger ale, pop, etc., as is proposed by said pending bill: Therefore be it

Resolved by the senate (the house concurring). That the Senators and Representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby, memorialized and requested to use their utmost endeavors to procure the passage of said revenue bill with the elimination of grape, loganberry, and apple juices from taxation therein as passed by the Senate of the United States; that copies of this concurrent resolution be forthwith forwarded to each member of the conference committee of the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress, and also copies to the Senators and Representatives from the States of Oregon and Washington.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5559) to authorize a preference right of entry by certain Carey Act entrymen, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 686) thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7236) to amend an act to permit the use of the right of way through the public lands for tramroads, canals, and reservoirs, and for other purposes, approved May 11, 1908, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 687) thereon.

Mr. SAULSBURY, from the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, to which was referred the bill (S. 5343) to authorize the Governor of the Territory of Hawaii to ratify the agreements of certain persons made with the commissioner of public lands of the Territory of Hawaii, and to issue land

patents to those eligible under the terms of said agreements, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 685) thereon.

Mr. ASHURST, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to which was referred the bill (S. 5516) to amend an act approved March 4, 1913, entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the enlargement, extension, remodeling, or improvement of certain public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, and for other purposes," reported it without amendment.

FRANCIS STEWART.

Mr. MYERS. From the Committee on Public Lands, I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (S. 4743) for the relief of Francis Stewart, and I submit a report (No. 689) thereon.

This bill was introduced by the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], and is one of the bills validating title to a homestead where there was some technical flaw. It is recommended by the Secretary of the Interior. In this particular case the claimant lived near the Mexican line and was not able to live on her homestead claim all the time the law required because she was driven away by Mexican marauders and invaders. Quite a number of bills of a similar character have passed the Senate, and they are now in the House. Very shortly there is to be an omnibus bill in the House, combining all bills of this character, and, if this bill is passed now, it will stand some show of being made an amendment to that omnibus bill. If not, it will never see the light of day in the House. I promised that, in the absence of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL], I would give it some attention. So with this statement I ask that the bill be read, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. No doubt it is a good bill; but it will lead to other requests of the same character.

Mr. MYERS. Yes; I ask unanimous consent, and I have one more bill for which I am going to make a similar request.

Mr. ASHURST. I will not object to the consideration of the bill just reported by the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue patent to Francis Stewart for the southwest quarter of section 33, township 28 south, range 7 west, New Mexico meridian.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I should like to ask a question or two in regard to the bill. I am not a member of the Committee on Public Lands, as the Senator knows, but I have had considerable experience with public-land affairs, and I wish to ask the Senator if there were any adverse claims in this particular case?

Mr. MYERS. None whatever. If there had been, I would not have favored the bill and would not now be asking unanimous consent for its consideration.

Mr. GRONNA. Is it a unanimous report?

Mr. MYERS. Yes; it is.

Mr. GRONNA. I have no objection to the bill.

Mr. MYERS. I have no personal interest in it; I am simply asking for its passage on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. FALL].

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOMESTEADS FOR SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Public Lands I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 13353) to extend the provisions of the homestead laws touching credit for period of enlistment to the soldiers, nurses, and officers of the Army and the seamen, marines, nurses, and officers of the Navy and the Marine Corps of the United States who have served or will have served with the Mexican border operations or during the war between the United States and Germany and her allies, and I submit a report (No. 688) thereon.

This bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. FRENCH, of Idaho, and gives to the soldiers and sailors who fought in the war with Germany and those who were on the Mexican border during the Mexican troubles the same rights in connection with taking up homesteads that are given by existing law to the soldiers of the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and the Philippine insurrection.

I introduced in this body and had favorably reported from the Committee on Public Lands of the Senate a bill which is substantially identical with this; but this being a House bill, I ask its passage by the Senate, and if it is passed I will move to indefinitely postpone the Senate bill. That is all there is to this bill; it is to give the soldiers and sailors of this war and those who served on the Mexican border the same rights in connection with the homestead laws as have heretofore been accorded to the veterans of the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and the Philippine insurrection. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I think the bill ought to be read. I should like to have the bill read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill does not seem to be with the report.

Mr. MYERS. There ought to be a bill with the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is; but it is all stricken out. It is the House Calendar bill, and the entire bill is stricken out. All there is is the title to a bill.

Mr. MYERS. I think there must be a bill accompanying the report. However, I ask leave to withdraw the report. I thought there was a copy of the bill with it. I ask to be allowed to withdraw the report. I do not care to make it at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report is withdrawn.

Mr. MYERS subsequently said: Mr. President, I now renew my request in regard to House bill 13353, which I again report from the Public Lands Committee, with the explanation I made a while ago. I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The report is now accompanied by a copy of the bill. I ask that the bill be read.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, subject to the conditions therein expressed as to length of service and honorable discharge, the provisions of sections 2304 and 2305, Revised Statutes of the United States, shall be applicable in all cases of military and naval service rendered in connection with the Mexican-border operations or during the war with Germany and its allies as defined by public resolution No. 32, approved August 29, 1916 (39 Stat. L. p. 671), and the act approved July 28, 1917 (40 Stat. L. p. 248).

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MYERS. I move that the bill (S. 5071) extending the benefits of sections 2304, 2305, and 2309, Revised Statutes of the United States, to those who rendered military or naval service during the Mexican-border troubles and the war with Germany and its allies, being Order of Business 617, and of which I am the author, be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be postponed indefinitely.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 5543) to increase limit of cost of a public building at Akron, Ohio; and

A bill (S. 5544) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to acquire, by purchase, condemnation, or otherwise, a suitable site and cause to be erected thereon a suitable building for the use and accommodation of the post office and other governmental offices at Canton, Ohio, at a cost not to exceed \$630,000, and to sell the present building and site; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. McLEAN:

A bill (S. 5545) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Enfield, Conn., three German cannon or field-pieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BORAH:

A bill (S. 5546) for the relief of Aaron Kibler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 5547) granting a pension to Joseph E. Dearborn (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KELLOGG:

A bill (S. 5548) to provide for the purchase of a site for and the construction of a public building at Ely, Minn.; and

A bill (S. 5549) to provide for the purchase of a site for and the construction of a public building at Rochester, Minn. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 5550) granting a pension to James A. Cox; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 5552) providing that the United States may be made a party defendant in the same manner as a private person in certain legal processes dealing with real property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TRANSPORTATION FOR AGRICULTURAL LABORERS.

Mr. GRONNA. I introduce a bill which I send to the desk, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD. It is very short. I have prepared a short statement to go with it, giving the reasons why the bill should be passed, and I also ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 5551) providing for a reduced rate for the transportation of laborers when traveling on the railroads of the United States under the direction and control of the United States Employment Service of the Department of Labor was read the first time by its title, the second time at length, and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Railroad Administration is hereby authorized and directed to inaugurate and establish a special rate of 1 cent per mile for the transportation of agricultural laborers engaged in the planting, cultivating, and harvesting of farm crops and the care of live stock when such agricultural laborers are traveling under the direction and control of the United States Employment Service of the Department of Labor.

The United States Railroad Administration and the United States Department of Labor are directed jointly to prepare and promulgate such rules and regulations as may be necessary to make effective the provisions of this act.

An emergency existing, this act shall become effective immediately following its enactment into law.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask that the statement I have referred to be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement is as follows:

REASONS FOR REDUCED RATE ON RAILROADS FOR AGRICULTURAL LABORERS.

To restore peace in the world we must provide the people with food and we must provide employment for labor at reasonable wages.

Many towns and cities of this country are reporting large and increasing numbers of unemployed.

An unquestioned shortage of farm labor for 1919 will prevent farmers from producing normal crops of all foodstuffs.

The farm-labor needs for this year are so serious that the farms of this country can furnish homes and employment for at least 2,000,000 men during the days of business reconstruction.

At present prices of crops on the farms and present excessive cost of railroad transportation farmers can not compete for labor, and transient farm labor can not profitably travel to the sections where most needed.

Many reports show that the men engaged in harvesting the wheat crop of 1918 will not return to assist in the harvesting of the 1919 crop, because of the fact that the cost of transportation consumed practically all of their earnings.

The experience of railroads in years past shows that the apparent loss on passenger earnings will be more than offset by the freight earnings as a result of increased crops.

The 1-cent railroad rate prevails in Canada, and is a material inducement in attracting labor to the farms, and has resulted in drawing thousands of skilled American farm laborers to the Canadian fields.

This is not class legislation, because of the two fundamental purposes: First, relieving the towns and cities of an increasing number of unemployed; and, second, the production and harvesting of increased crops which must result in benefits to all concerned.

RIVER AND HARBOR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. CALDER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. WALSH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 441), which was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized during the Sixty-fifth Congress to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not to exceed \$1 per printed page, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee; that the committee may sit during the sessions or recesses of the Senate; and that expenses contracted hereunder shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANKLIN K. LANE.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, almost daily we have in this body discussions of international questions, particularly discussions of a world league of nations. I believe in a reasonable discussion of those subjects. I believe on the subject of a world league of nations the sentiment of this country should be crystallized. I myself like to hear discussions of that important subject from different viewpoints; for while, with certain restrictions and under certain conditions, I favor a world league of nations, I have not entirely determined in my own mind as to all of the details of which should be incorporated into an agreement for such a league. I feel that I need enlightenment.

I have here a very able and interesting address, of moderate length, which was delivered on the subject of a league of nations in New York recently by Hon. Franklin K. Lane, the very able and distinguished Secretary of the Interior. With much of it I agree; all of it is illuminating, and I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD. It will be well worth anyone's reading.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, in talking upon this subject the temptation would be to paint a picture of what Europe is, but I know that your heartstrings have been touched to the limit and that it is not necessary for me to present to you any reason why war should be made to cease or why war should be made less likely to happen.

"The President of the United States is in Paris not by your order but to carry out your wish. For the business men of the United States have by a referendum vote declared what their desire is. They do not wish merely a peace, the settlement of the immediate problem, but they wish something more lasting, something more fundamental, something that has been entitled 'A League of Nations'—something that really is, in essence, nothing more than international cooperation. And in this time, when that man stands before the world preeminently as the representative of this great people, he is entitled to the support of every American because he is the President of all of us.

"He is there, to be sure, as the representative of an ideal, but it is an ideal that is not his own ideal alone; it is the ideal of the chambers of commerce of the United States, the ideal of the statesmen of this time and of statesmen for many centuries.

"The business man wants peace because war is expensive. When this war came to an end we were spending \$50,000,000 per day. Not only is it expensive but it is unreasonable. I do not say that all wars are unreasonable, or that all wars have no justification. But war is unreasonable, certainly in 99 per cent of the cases, for the reason that it gets nowhere. It will not stand the pragmatic test; it does not work; it does not solve the difficulty in the end. But there is a greater reason why you gentlemen are for some plan by which mutual guaranties can be given, and that is because you believe in a greater America, and we can not spend our time nor our boys' time in thinking of war when we have other things to think of that are much greater than the destruction of life.

"We have a continent that we have still to master. We have resources that we have still to bring forth. Our days of pioneering have largely passed. They passed, I believe, with the beginning of this century, but now we have come to a time of intensive development—a new America in the abundance and variety of its resources, physical, intellectual, spiritual.

"The question arises in every mind, Is such a plan practicable? And there are men who will say that it can not be made to work.

"America my friends is not the product of a philosophy of despair; America is the creature of optimism and confidence.

"At present we are in an eddy; the great stream is flowing on, but in the United States we are in a bit of back current. You feel it, I feel it, the country expresses it.

"In a certain sense the war came to an end too soon, because we, in our minds, had prepared for a war that would last until next summer, and then great things would be done, and the enemy forced to surrender. But you know just what happened. Far off on the eastern end, where the war had begun, there suddenly came a drive through Macedonia, and then there came the magnificent effort on the west front, and before we knew it Bulgaria had surrendered, Austria had put in her plea, Germany had thrown up her hands in surrender, and the armistice had come.

"But in a time such as this, when we are naturally feeling a reaction from the stress, strain, struggle, and sacrifice of heroic effort for two years and more, you can not judge of the American mind. A league of nations is demanded by the peoples of the world, and something in that order will result, because it is expressive of a great impulse, a great desire, a real world demand.

"Why should anyone say that such a league can not be? The man who wrote the greatest study of America is Mr. Bryce. He stands for it stanchly. The man who brought England into this war for an ideal as well as for self-protective reasons, Lord Grey, is for it. The man who stands at the head of the British Government and who has recently been almost unanimously indorsed and commended by his people, who has carried this war on in behalf of his country to a successful conclusion, Lloyd George, believes in it. You and I agitated for it before the war came upon us. We knew that something in the way of international cooperation must be evolved or else the world would be doomed to live in a state of unending fear. Men of imagina-

tion all over the world have been writing books about it until it has come to be that people have thought that it was merely a dream, a utopian vision, something by which in a strange and magical way the millennium was to be brought about. Why should international cooperation be impossible? What is the growth of society except the growth of cooperation?

STANDS FOR COOPERATION.

"What is this association that I am addressing and the thousand associations like it in the United States—what are they but cooperative effort? What is this city in which you club together for the purpose of getting sewerage and water systems and streets? And the State and the Nation—what are these but expressions of cooperative effort? The distinctive movement of our day is away from an intense individualism in business and toward gathering together, seeing eye to eye, sitting across the table and talking out difficulties, exchange of thought, of method, of purpose. So that those who stand against international cooperation are standing against the very trend of business life, the trend of labor organizations, the trend of scientific effort, the trend of the centuries. Why, gentlemen, there were 135 international conferences held the year before the war. We have in existence already machinery of one kind and another which directly touches international effort, such as the Postal Union, a union that spreads throughout the whole world.

"No one can say, therefore, that this thing is a mere vision; that it is a dream that can not be made true. It is, of course, possible to believe that the thing that we want is a thing that can not be perfected at once; that it can not spring full-fledged out of the mind of any statesman.

"Political machinery, like all other machinery, is a dream first and then passes through phases of valueless crudeness to phases of perfecting utility—and perhaps never becomes perfect. And who are we to say that in a day when men are drawing nitrogen out of the air by electric process, in a day when you can talk to a man 5,000 feet above you by wireless telephone, the inventive mind of man has stopped. Why, the Constitution of the United States itself was the first invention along practical lines of politics in a thousand years.

"International law is filmy, founded upon unrelated precedents, without certainty, precision, or definiteness. We should know the law between nations as we know the law within nations. Some day it must be drafted and by some one. Why not now at the Paris conference? Some body of men must meet and out of the experiences of the nations find those rules of international conduct which have been generally accepted by the most advanced of the nations and crystallize them into form and give them sanction. An international code commission is needed to declare the accepted law (if it can be said that there is any accepted international law) and to present to the nations for their ratification such new laws as may be needed both in the promotion of intercourse, commerce, and peace, and in the conduct of war. This would be the foundation of a league of nations.

"Here would be an agreement, between those who chose to make it, that they would accept definite rules by which they would be governed as between each other. Such a commission would not be an international or supernational legislature. All that it did would be referred for approval and adoption to the nations; those who joined in its drafting and those which had not done so. A code so formed would grow as all law has grown, from a simple presentation of a few rules or principles into a more complex and elaborate body as time went on. This surely would not be revolutionary; it would not offend national pride or set at naught national sovereignty. We could cover such matters as we wished, and only such matters as we wished, in such a code.

"But in that code there should be incorporated one agreement, binding on all who signed it, that it must be the law between the nations, and if controversies arose as to the matters dealt with in the code that they would be submitted to a judicial tribunal formed by the nations for the interpretation and application of the law and would abide by the decision of that court.

"That agreement would call for a surrender—a surrender on the part of all the members of the league—of the right to go to war over a matter which they had agreed should be a matter for decision by a court. Such agreements are not uncommon among business men. There is hardly a contract of consequence drawn to-day that does not contain such a provision. And the history of nations each year grows richer with the record of cases where differences between nations as to specific matters are relegated to just such tribunals. Sir Frederick Pollock has gathered the fact that since the year 1815 there have been more than 150 cases arising out of international conflict of interest which

have been submitted to the decision of chosen arbitrators, and in no case has war resulted from the decision rendered.

"This most pregnant fact must be regarded here that in the code itself there would be eliminated from controversy a great volume of matters over which disputes might arise. For instance, the parties to the league would definitely state and agree upon the territorial boundaries of the countries affected. There would be a settlement, clear and distinct, of this most prolific cause of trouble. There might well be a setting forth of the rights of nationals in foreign lands, another abundant source of difficulty. And the rights of nations to enforce the claims of private individuals for loans made to foreign governments might be dealt with in such manner as to make clear and unequivocal the nature of the remedy that the individual making the loan would have. In a word, the code itself would eliminate from the field of uncertainty a not inconsiderable percentage, perhaps an overwhelming majority, of the causes of international trouble and make a resort to the court unnecessary.

"If, however, there developed a controversy which one or both of the parties would not submit to the court, or after a court decision one or both would not accept it, what method of enforcement could there be?

"The league could have a weapon which the world has never tried but which, I do believe, would prove more coercive than any plan that has been devised, as cruel in some ways as war itself, and devoid of any of those meretricious calls which make war so often popular. In harsh, undiplomatic language this process would be called international boycott—the severance of every tie that connected the nations of the league with the offending nation. Cut the railroads at the border, the telegraphs, telephones, postal service, steamboat lines, all communication; allow no one to have ingress or egress; allow no bank to deal with any bank in that country; no cattle, no coal, no steel, no food, no letters; cut off all life; let the nation be as one that did not exist to the rest of the world. It is hardly thinkable that any nation would refuse to submit a controversy to a court's decision if it knew of such a possible punishment. But if it still was obdurate war must follow. An international police force would, however, not be a necessity, for nations have learned to cooperate under a unified command in the past year and national forces might again be united to carry out a common pledge.

"This does not seem to me an impossible, impracticable, unreliable plan. It does not prevent war; it makes it unlikely, most improbable. Of course, if such a plan were inaugurated and by its means the world was brought through difficulties the plan would gradually prove the lessening need for great armaments and disarmament would slowly come about.

"There are difficulties to be overcome in instituting any such plan. Who are to constitute the league? I should answer those whose territories are clearly defined, who have a settled form of constitutional government under which they are living in peace, and who are so behaving themselves as to be worthy of a place at the table of the family of nations.

"Would it not imperil the interests of the greater powers if they had to be subject to the will of the smaller? It has never been proposed that all nations should have an equal vote in the league. The one stable tribunal organized by The Hague conference was the international prize court, in which the United States had 20 votes as against a single vote for most of the smaller nations. This was arrived at by considering population, wealth, ships at sea, volume and value of sea traffic, and other elements. It was arrived at by a process known to you as the weighted average.

"Would not the Monroe doctrine be surrendered by the formation of such a league? The answer to this is that the Monroe doctrine is a declaration that the territorial integrity and national independence of the nations on this hemisphere shall not be invaded by any European power. That doctrine might well be written into the code to which the nations would subscribe, and it has so long been accepted that I doubt if the right to have it made a part of the code would be challenged. In fact, the very first of the proposals made by the President for such a league is the declaration of this very doctrine. Here are his words:

"A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small nations alike.

"But the right to enforce this doctrine might be taken from the United States. True, that burden might not remain exclusively our own. And yet there is no reason why in the formation of the league there could not be a recognition that certain principles and doctrines would be within the care of certain subordinate groups—a pan-American league, if you please, as

to matters of all American concern and perhaps a district sub-organization for Europe and another for Asia.

"Thought—sympathetic thought—will solve many problems. If we wish international cooperation to stop wars and to make more free and sure the intercourse of the peoples of the world, we can find the machinery by which it can be brought about. The whole difficulty now rests in prejudice and fear and suspicion. Why not in our fine American way rather say that the thing that should be done can be done. The engineers of our Army have adopted as a motto these words: 'It can't be done. Here it is.' We may find, gentlemen, that this motto is that of the peace conferees in Paris. They may return saying to all doubting Thomases, 'It can't be done. Here it is.'

"My appeal is that you then give to those who represent you the strength of your support and believe that the inventive mind of man has not ceased functioning. Let us believe that something will come out of the dreams that you and others have had.

"I can visualize President Wilson in his entrance to Paris as he goes down the Champs de Elysees with the cheering crowds and, crossing the bridge to Napoleon's tomb, he looks down upon the sarcophagus that holds the body of the greatest warrior of the world, who spread his power across Europe and dared to think of spreading it across the whole of the world between the Atlantic and the Pacific.

"The President goes out the door of that church down the boulevard until he comes to another monument, a monument that more nearly represents the spirit of our new day, the monument to Pasteur.

"Pasteur is sitting above, looking down. On three sides of the base are figures representing what he did for France, a boy with sheep and a man with oxen, a girl with grapes, indicating his cure of the phylloxera. Then in front is the main group, a girl wan, weak, exhausted, emaciated, has risen from her couch and is leaning against her mother, who is looking up into the eyes of Pasteur above with a look of ineffable gratitude as a figure of death slinks around the opposite side.

"Woodrow Wilson goes to Europe not as a conqueror. He goes for the healing of nations; he goes to add greater glory to the name of America."

SHIP WORKERS' STRIKE.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, on yesterday the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] inserted into the RECORD two documents bearing the signature of Mr. Charles Piez, Director General of the United States Shipping Board Emergency Fleet Corporation, and referring to a strike at Seattle which, I think the Senator said, might be by this morning State wide in its operation.

I received a telegram this morning from one Morris D. Leehey from Seattle, a very long telegram, which I shall not read in its entirety, but which I shall hereafter ask to insert in the RECORD, that in some respects is the most remarkable document I have ever received.

This telegram, which probably has been duplicated to other Members of this body, embodies a statement published in a Seattle paper yesterday morning which informs me among other things that those now engaged in the strike at Seattle will feed the people; that they have 12 great kitchens which have been offered and from them food will be distributed by the provision trade at low cost to all; also that labor will care for the babies of the State; that milk-wagon drivers and laundry drivers are arranging plans for supplying milk to the babies, invalids, and so forth; and that the washing of hospital linen will be permitted; also that the stopping of cars will keep some people at home; also that the strike committee is arranging for guards; and while a few hot-headed enthusiasts complain that the strikers only should be fed and the general public left to endure severe discomfort, that is too inhumanitarian to be considered. Then follows a very strong and caustic criticism of the order of Mr. Piez, and the telegram concludes with the following warning:

If the strike continues labor may feel led to avoid public suffering by reopening more and more activities under its own management; and that is why we say that we are starting on a road that leads no one knows where.

Mr. President, the announcement of Mr. Piez informs us that between the Government and these men are existing agreements and boards which have been recognized for the settlement of all further disputes which may arise during the operation of the shipyards. It also informs us, what people perhaps know generally, that the rates of wages paid at these yards are greater than have ever been paid before and fully commensurate with all the requirements due to the advanced cost of living, and so forth.

Mr. President, if I interpret this telegram correctly, it means that certain private organizations have taken over the governmental functions of the city of Seattle, and that they will administer them so that there will be as little suffering as possible consequent upon this very much-disturbed condition.

I imagine that if the packers of Chicago should for the purpose of advancing their prices announce that none of their supplies would be served to the public until their demands for advanced prices were recognized and conceded, and in the meantime they would feed the babies and take care of invalids and exercise general police regulations of the great city of Chicago, everyone would recognize in it the assumption by that great combination of governmental powers for the purpose of enforcing a private demand, and the indignation and protests of American citizens would be universal. I see no difference, Mr. President, between such conduct by such an organization and that which, if this telegram is interpreted correctly, is now prevailing in the city of Seattle.

If this strike is to become State wide, as the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] fears, I think it is safe to assume that State governmental functions will also be assumed, and for similar reasons. There, then, will not be an imperium in imperio, but a usurpation of governmental authority.

I think, therefore, that it is easy for any reflecting man to conclude where all this leads to. It leads either to the overthrow of established government in that section of the country, or it will tend to bring it into deserved disrespect and disrepute. It means, Mr. President, the experiment of bolshevism upon the northwest coast of America, and is preceded by a disregard of solemn agreements, which indicates that the binding force of compromise is not recognized in that section of the country.

Mr. President, I am by nature pessimistic and may take a gloomier view of conditions like this than the facts warrant; but they are another indication, to my mind, of the extremely sinister features of the social and industrial conditions in America, particularly in the great community centers of this country, and that it is the symptom or early manifestation of a situation the gravity of which we do not fully appreciate.

I have denounced, and I shall continue to denounce and to criticize all invasion of governmental prerogative and individual right by combinations of capital and finance. I recognize fully that the work of these combinations has caused, and are causing much of the resentment which finds expression in this manner; and I assert that the duty of the Government is to control and to curb the one, just as much as it is its duty to control and curb the other; but its duty in each direction is manifest. In this country, Mr. President, there is no need that any person or association of persons complaining of or suffering from abuses should resort to violence or lawlessness for the purpose of righting his or their complaint. This is a Government of the people. It furnishes ample machinery for the enforcement of right and for the redress of wrong through the agencies that machinery provides.

I believe that these immediate manifestations of coming trouble require that they be met with a promptitude and efficiency by the authorities charged with the duty of asserting the Government's power to safeguard life and property, and, as well, recognize and enforce the rights and remedy the wrongs of all.

A soup line or a bread line is, in any event, a deplorable thing in a country like this—we have had too many of them—but a soup line or a bread line provided by those who are engaged in disregarding or overriding the established authority and for those who are helpless because the Government will not perform its functions and take care that the laws are properly enforced is an anomaly in civilization everywhere, yet that seems to be the situation in Seattle. Mr. President, I have no doubt, at least, I hope, that the authorities of that great municipality and the executive of the State will be sufficiently appreciative of their duties at this time to vindicate the requirements and the majesty of republican government in that city and in the State if further developments require it.

Mr. President, America must be for Americans. By that term I do not mean those who are native born, but every man who believes that the institutions of his country are worth preserving and respects the reign of law and order must do his bit toward their preservation. The time has come, indeed it has been apparent to me for some time, when little, petty, partisan differences, the struggles for party advantage, must be subordinated to the supreme duty of vindicating the majesty of the laws and the Constitution of the United States and of the States. This Seattle affair is an object lesson of our disregard of that supreme duty, of our indifference to the welfare of the country, and of our proneness to fall back upon that old system of laissez

faire which trusts to luck, with an indifference that will lead us to the precipice and which assumes that things will right themselves as they go along.

The time has come, it is here, Mr. President, when every man and woman in the United States who believes that this country is worth preserving and the best and freest in the world, and who feels that the war which we have just won is only a step in the right direction, should by their acts manifest their faith and stand by the country's institutions now, be the sacrifice what it may, when domestic insurrection is raising its head and threatening them more seriously than it has in the past.

I ask that the telegram from which I have read may be inserted in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The telegram is as follows:

SEATTLE, WASH., February 5, 1919.

Senator CHARLES H. THOMAS.

2490 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D. C.:

The following appeared on the first page of the Seattle Daily Union Record under date of Tuesday, February 4, 1919: "On Thursday at 10 a. m. there will be many cheering, and there will be some who fear; both these emotions are useful, but not too much of either. We are undertaking the most tremendous move ever made by labor in this country, a move which will lead no one knows where. We do not need hysteria; we need the iron march of labor. Labor will feed the people. Twelve great kitchens have been offered, and from them food will be distributed by the provision trades at low cost to all. Labor will care for the babies and the sick. The milk-wagon drivers and the laundry drivers are arranging plans for supplying milk to babies, invalids, and hospitals and taking care of the cleaning of linen for hospitals. Labor will preserve order. The strike committee is arranging for guards, and it is expected that the stopping of the cars will keep people at home. A few hot-headed enthusiasts have complained that strikers only should be fed and the general public left to endure severe discomfort. Aside from the inhumanitarian character of such suggestions, let them get this straight: Not the withdrawal of labor power but the power of the workers to manage will win this strike. What does Mr. Piez, of the Shipping Board care about the closing down of Seattle's shipyards, or even of all the industries of the Northwest? Will it not merely strengthen the yards at Hog Island, in which he is more interested? When the shipyard owners of Seattle were on the point of agreeing with the workers it was Mr. Piez who wired them that if they so agreed he would not let them have steel. Whether this is camouflage we have no means of knowing, but we do know that the great eastern combinations of capitalists could afford to offer privately to Mr. Skinner, Mr. Ames, and Mr. Duthie a few millions apiece in eastern shipyard stock rather than let the workers win the closing down of Seattle's industries, as a mere shutdown will not affect these eastern gentlemen much. They could let the whole Northwest go to pieces as far as money alone is concerned, but the closing down of the capitalistically controlled industries of Seattle while the workers organize to feed the people, to care for the babies and the sick, to preserve order—this will move them, for this looks too much like the taking over of power by the workers. Labor will not only shut down the industries, but labor will reopen under the management of the appropriate trades such activities as are needed to preserve public health and public peace. If the strike continues, labor may feel led to avoid public suffering by reopening more and more activities under its own management, and that is why we say that we are starting on a road that leads no one knows where."

MORRIS D. LEEHEY.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I shall not attempt to add to what the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] has so well said. He has expressed my sentiments much better than I could express them myself. I wish I could present a statement showing that conditions are not so bad in Seattle as the information which we have had would indicate; but I can not do so. I have not gathered the force of the telegram, from which the Senator from Colorado has read; but I know the gentleman who signed it. He is one of the leading attorneys of Seattle. I have a telegram, however, from which I desire to read a line or two, which I received this morning from Seattle, from a gentleman whom I know there, as follows:

Conservative opinion regards strike situation presents serious possibilities. Strikers openly advised to take what they want, and robbery becoming frequent. Believe Government should prepare to furnish troops without moment's delay, if requested.

I am not advised as to what steps the local or State authorities have taken. I believe they will act promptly and effectively to protect life and property and to see that peace and order are maintained. On yesterday, in presenting the statement of Mr. Piez, I stated that possibly by that time the strike had become State wide. I was mistaken as to the time. The time fixed for a State-wide strike was this morning at 10 o'clock. It may be that it has now been consummated. I wish I had full information to give to the Senate; but this is all that I have.

I have here two additional statements made by Mr. Piez. I do not believe that they add very much to the facts contained in the statements which I presented yesterday, but they do present some additional facts; and I think it well that we should have the full statements available.

Probably there may be another side to this question. If so, I shall be glad to present the same to the Senate. This is a statement, however, by the representative of the Government. The statement gives the agreement made by the men and the treatment that has been accorded by the Government to them. This controversy is really between them and the Government and not

between the men and the shipyard owners. Mr. Piez points this out. I think, Mr. President, that I shall ask that these two statements may also be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statements are as follows:

Second statement by Charles Piez, Director General Emergency Fleet Corporation, Philadelphia, published as an advertisement in the Pacific coast newspapers.

The future of the shipbuilding industry lies with the men and the management. It is as much the problem of the one side as of the other. Increased output and lower costs can be secured by more intelligent direction and effort without sacrifice to either side.

But it can be done only by sympathetic and intelligent cooperation between the ship workers and the yard owners; never by strike and strife.

The strike is not only a breach of an agreement with the Government, but, with the future of the industry hanging in the balance, it is a colossal business mistake.

Congress authorized the President of the United States to spend \$5,500,000,000 for the construction of ships, and the President selected the Emergency Fleet Corporation as his agent to carry out this program. The German submarine was at that time sinking vessels from four to five times as fast as English and American yards were producing them.

It was America's job to beat the submarine. Old shipyards were expanded and new yards were built on both the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts.

Contracts were placed for wood ships, composite ships, concrete ships, and steel ships—for any ship that would float, propel itself, and serve any kind of a useful purpose—because we were building a fleet for an emergency.

Wages were increased. Overtime and Sunday work were ordered. Carloads of necessary material were sent by express. Three hundred thousand men were added to the 50,000 ship workers, and the Government bore the expense of transporting them and training them. The Government paid these beginners high wages while they were acquiring skill and experience, for the Nation needed ships and was willing to pay the price.

The yards of the Pacific coast and the Great Lakes responded nobly, for they had been longer in the game and had a larger number of experienced ship workers to draw from. Even the new yards created since the war was declared began deliveries.

Then the armistice was declared and the shipbuilding situation was changed overnight. The Nation began figuring the costs.

And the Emergency Fleet Corporation was asked, "If you were building a lot of ships for an emergency, why don't you quit now that the emergency is over?"

"Ships are costing the Government from two and a half to three times what they cost three years ago, and 50 per cent more than they can be bought in England at the present time. So quit building till the costs go down to where we can compete."

The Emergency Fleet Corporation thereupon took account of stock. It found that it was building more wood ships than it could use or sell, and so it canceled those that hadn't been begun.

It found that a merchant marine was something more than an aggregation of ships. It had to be a well-balanced fleet, that provided a certain proportion of fast passenger ships, of slower-going passenger and cargo carriers, and of many ships built especially for certain lines of trade.

And upon review of the numbers and types of vessels building under the emergency program, the Emergency Fleet Corporation decided to suspend work on a portion of it so, in case Congress decided to permit us to spend the money authorized, it could substitute more desirable and necessary types of ships for those suspended.

It is impossible to build a perfect "ready to use" merchant marine. Parts of it, at least, must be built to suit the needs of business that will develop through the effort and enterprise of the future.

It is necessary, therefore, to proceed more slowly than heretofore in the completion of the present program. Overtime and Sunday work and other expenses due to speed have therefore been cut out.

And we are calling on the managements and the ship workers to cooperate in such a way as to make high wages and low labor costs possible in the shipyards as it has been made possible in the automobile industry.

Let me cite three examples of how high wages and reduced output per man have increased the labor costs of vessels. One of the best producing yards on the Pacific coast shows that the average output per man is 70 per cent of that of two years ago, and the average rate of pay 70 per cent higher. This means a labor cost two and four-tenths times greater than two years ago.

Three Atlantic coast yards show labor costs from two and a half to three times higher than two years ago.

We can look for more output per man as the new men in the yards grow in experience, but in the meantime the future of the industry is in the balance.

Foreign orders can not be secured until costs go down, and even the Government can not continue shipbuilding indefinitely if every ship shows a heavy loss.

I am presenting the facts as they are before the United States Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and my advice to the men is: Go back to work and get together with the owners to see what can be done to put the shipyards in shape to compete for the world's business in shipbuilding.

CHARLES PIEZ,
Director General United States Shipping
Board Emergency Fleet Corporation.

PHILADELPHIA, February 3, 1919.

Interview sent out for Pacific coast newspapers for publication Tuesday morning, February 4.

Charles Piez, Director General of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, to-day authorized the following statement in regard to the strike of the ship workers on the Pacific coast:

"In all fairness the men who have broken their obligations, under the Macy award, and walked out, demanding higher wages, should consider the economic menace imposed upon the Nation by their action."

"They should give consideration to the fact that the war is over and that the emergency to meet which the United States Government entered upon its great shipbuilding program is a thing of the past. Our shipbuilding enterprise was started and carried to this point under very unusual circumstances. Congress appropriated \$3,500,000,000 to build a fleet of merchant vessels with which to meet the emergency of war, and the President designated the Emergency Fleet Corporation as

his agent to carry out this construction program. At the time this enterprise was started the rate of sinkings by German submarines indicated that 13,000,000 tons of shipping would be sunk during the year 1917. This rate was not maintained, but, nevertheless, 9,000,000 tons of shipping actually were sunk during that year.

"America's job was to beat the German submarines by new construction. No money was spared. Every means for expanding the shipbuilding facilities of the country was utilized. The existing yards were expanded to the very limit of their capacities and vast new yards were constructed.

"We started out to build ships of all types. Steel, wood, composite, and concrete vessels were ordered constructed at the highest possible speed. We needed ships, and were not particular what type was constructed, so long as we got vessels that would float. Anything within reason to help meet the emergency was undertaken.

"To quicken completion of this gigantic task the Government met every demand for increased pay that was consistent with the rising cost of living, and gave the shipyard workers opportunity for additional earnings by encouraging overtime and Sunday work at increased rates. Speed, not economy, was the goal. When ship construction was delayed by lack of materials, we even resorted to the costly expedient of sending steel by express to the yards.

"In the extremity which the Nation faced we called for and obtained the services of 300,000 new men to bolster the force of 50,000 employed in the shipyards when this enterprise was started. The Government transported these men to their jobs at its own expense and undertook to train them in the crafts of shipbuilding. Not only that, but it paid them high wages while they were learning their trades.

"In the emergency of war all this expenditure, which would rightly be called extravagance in peace time, was not only justified but was absolutely imperative. It was just as much to the interest of the shipbuilder that the emergency fleet be constructed on time as to the interest of the Government at Washington. It was the Nation's effort, and every man, woman, and child in the country was benefited by our victory over the submarine.

"Remember, at the time of which I am speaking we were not building ships primarily for trade purposes but to meet a dreadful danger that was daily becoming more threatening. The lives of millions of soldiers were at stake and the outcome of the war largely depended upon our success in this emergency shipbuilding program.

"Now the conditions are changed. The war is over and we must turn our attention to the economic needs of the Nation. The necessities of war-time construction brought the labor cost per ship to such a high figure that to-day it represents a large part of the total cost of a steel vessel. This is not all due to the increases in rates of pay. It is due largely to a decline in labor efficiency, due to dilution. We are getting less to-day in return for the high wages paid to shipbuilders than we got at the comparatively low pay which obtained in the shipyards two years ago.

"In the most efficient shipyard in the Seattle district the average pay is 70 per cent more than it was two years ago and the output about 70 per cent of what it was two years ago. Wages have increased from 50 to 100 per cent in the shipyards of America, but there has not been a corresponding increase in output. This situation to-day threatens to throttle the shipbuilding industry. It must be corrected if the industry is to live.

"High wages are not at all inconsistent with low costs, and American labor always has been able to compete with the lower-paid foreign labor by making up through efficiency and quantity output the difference between the respective rates of pay. I have no doubt that American shipyard labor to-day can continue to compete with foreign shipworkers on the same basis. But to increase the wage scale before increased experience and improved output have been attained is sheer folly. It would result simply in forcing America out of the shipbuilding industry.

"Now that we have peace we must have assurance that the profits earned by a ship will pay for the cost of the ship. Otherwise, our merchant-marine project is doomed in advance to failure.

"The time has come to build larger and faster steamers for trade purposes. That is the problem of the Emergency Fleet Corporation. There rests upon the shipyard workers an obligation equally as important as that which the Emergency Fleet Corporation faces. It is the duty of these men—a duty they owe to themselves, to their communities, and to the Nation—to increase their average output and justify their present high wages by efficient work. To demand pay without such justification is wrong in principle and impossible in practice.

"I do not believe the present situation is hopeless, although the economic aspects of our program are most discouraging at this time. An extreme case may be cited in three Atlantic coast yards which show a labor cost from two and one-half to three times higher than two years ago. Now, the output of these yards will be greater when the new men become experienced. I have an unshakable faith in the ability of American labor to make good on this test provided they refuse to listen to radical counsel and abide by their own agreements. Meanwhile, frankly, the future of the whole industry is in the balance.

"To-day England, with lower labor cost and higher efficiency, can build ships much cheaper than we. We can not hope to obtain foreign orders until our costs go down.

"The future lies with the men and the managements. They must get together and cooperate for more intelligent direction and effort. This can be done without sacrifice to either side. I believe that sympathetic and intelligent cooperation between the yard workers and the yard owners will solve the problem, but it can not be solved by strikes and strife.

"The strike not only was a breach of faith with the Government, but in the light of present conditions in the shipbuilding industry was a colossal business blunder.

"CHARLES PIEZ."

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Washington how many of these men are on strike?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I understand that some thirty or forty thousand went on strike a short time ago.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Is the strike confined to the shipbuilders?

Mr. JONES of Washington. No; it has been spreading. The Central Labor Council of Seattle, I understand, has indorsed the strike, which I suppose would be termed a sympathetic strike; and several of the labor organizations have indorsed it. I am advised by a telegram which I received day before yesterday from a point outside of Seattle, as I construe the telegram, that a State-wide strike would be inaugurated this morning at 10 o'clock in sympathy, of course, with the shipyard strike.

Mr. VARDAMAN. That includes all the labor organizations, I presume?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I apprehend that it goes very far. I do not know, however, as I say, how far it goes. I have not received, I am sorry to say, very much detailed information from the State. In fact, about all I have had is what I read from the telegram this morning, except the telegrams which I received the other day, which simply stated that the situation was serious and that probably a State-wide strike would be inaugurated this morning at 10 o'clock.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I call for the regular order. The VICE PRESIDENT. Concurrent and other resolutions are in order.

AMERICAN TROOPS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I desire to call up Senate resolution 411, introduced by me on January 13, 1919, and I ask the Chair to lay it before the Senate.

Mr. POMERENE. I was not able to hear what the resolution is about.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. It is Senate resolution 411, introduced on the 13th day of January, 1919, and reads as follows:

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate the soldiers of the United States as soon as practicable should be withdrawn from Russia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That resolution is on the calendar.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. No, sir; I beg the pardon of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is on the table; I see. Is there any objection?

Mr. KING. I object.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry, if you please. May not a resolution of this sort that lies on the table be called up?

The VICE PRESIDENT. By unanimous consent it may be taken up on the first day following, upon the request of the Senator who introduces it. If it lies here for a month or two, it can be taken up by unanimous consent, or, if unanimous consent is not granted, it can be taken up on motion.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Then, Mr. President, I move that this particular resolution be taken up by the Senate.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator withhold that motion?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baird	Hollis	Martin, Va.	Simmons
Bankhead	Johnson, Cal.	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Calder	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Smoot
Colt	Jones, Wash.	New	Sterling
Culberson	Kellogg	Nugent	Sutherland
Cummins	Kenyon	Overman	Swanson
Curtis	King	Page	Thomas
Dillingham	Kirby	Penrose	Thompson
Fernald	Knox	Pittman	Townsend
Fletcher	La Follette	Polldexter	Trammell
France	Lenroot	Pollock	Underwood
Frelinghuysen	Lewis	Pomerene	Vardaman
Gay	Lodge	Reed	Wadsworth
Gerry	McCumber	Saulsbury	Walsh
Gronna	McKellar	Shafroth	Warren
Hale	McLean	Sheppard	Weeks
Henderson	McNary	Sherman	

Mr. SUTHERLAND. My colleague, the senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. Goff], is absent on account of illness. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. GAY. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] is detained on official business.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM] on official business.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I wish to announce that the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. ROBINSON] is absent on official business. I wish also to announce that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. SMITH] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] are detained by illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. Is there further morning business?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I renew the motion that was made a brief period ago, that Senate resolution 411 be laid before the Senate and be taken up at present.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, if the Senator desires to press that motion at this time, I shall have to ask for the yeas and nays upon the vote. At this particular time it would displace

important matters which it was already arranged should be taken up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood that the Senator from Utah objected.

Mr. KING. I did.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is ruling that as soon as the hour of 1 o'clock shall have arrived—

Mr. LEWIS. Two o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair is saying 1 o'clock—that until the hour of 1 o'clock has arrived only by unanimous consent can anything other than the usual morning business be transacted.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, in the confusion I could not catch the ruling of the Chair. I understand the ruling of the Chair to be, however, that until 1 o'clock the motion is not in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Or until the morning business has been concluded. That is the plain rule. The Chair will refer to it, if desired. It is Rule VII, section 3:

Until the morning business shall have been concluded and so announced from the chair, or until the hour of 1 o'clock has arrived, no motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill, resolution, etc., shall be entertained.

It is only five minutes. We will get through by that time, I guess. Are there other bills or joint resolutions?

BRITISH EMBARGO ON IMPORTS.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to take up for present consideration Senate resolution 438, which was under consideration when the morning hour closed on yesterday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any further morning business? There being no further morning business, the Chair, understanding that the resolution went over yesterday without prejudice—

Mr. LODGE. It did.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is therefore laid before the Senate.

The Secretary read Senate resolution 438, introduced by Mr. WEEKS on the 4th instant, as follows:

Whereas during the war with the Imperial German Government Great Britain placed prohibitions on the importation of certain American products; and

Whereas the British Government has recently placed a prohibition on the importation of additional American products to take effect on and after March 1, 1919, which is detrimental to the employment at their full capacity of our manufacturing industries; and

Whereas this action of the British Government is in direct conflict with point numbered 3 of the 14 points of peace proposed in the message of the President of the United States to the Congress of January 8, 1918: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested to inform the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, what steps, if any, have been taken by the Department of State to request the British Government to modify or suspend such prohibition.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. KING. I move to amend the resolution by striking out the third whereas in the preamble, which reads as follows:

Whereas this action of the British Government is in direct conflict with point numbered 3 of the 14 points of peace proposed in the message of the President of the United States to the Congress of January 8, 1918.

Mr. WEEKS. While I may not object to striking out those words, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if he does not think that is a correct statement?

Mr. KING. No; I do not; quite the contrary. I do not think the action alleged to have been taken by Great Britain is at all in contravention of any of the points stated by President Wilson.

Mr. WEEKS. I am in direct disagreement with the Senator on that point. I thought it added to the force of the resolution, but I really do not care whether it goes out or stays in.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the preamble proposed by the Senator from Utah.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, just one word concerning the resolution. I express no opinion in regard to the criticisms made yesterday of Great Britain and the economic policy which it is alleged she is now pursuing. Neither do I express any opinion as to the wisdom or lack of wisdom in laying embargoes upon imports under the circumstances in which nations now find themselves. I am, though, somewhat surprised at the attitude taken by the Senator from Massachusetts. He belongs to that school of political thought which teaches that high tariffs and embargoes are the panacea for all our industrial and economic ills. He belongs to the party that has advocated for so many years not only a restrictive tariff,

but too often a tariff alleged to be a protective tariff but which in practice was a prohibitive tariff; a party that has exhibited a vast amount of solicitude for rich manufacturers who were the beneficiaries of the protective system and who profited by exploiting labor and overcharging the American consumer.

If it be a fact that Great Britain has imposed an embargo upon certain products, she is merely giving to the world a practical illustration of the doctrine which forms the corner stone of Republicanism, and the application of which should prove a source of joy to the Senator from Massachusetts. Indeed, it is a sort of apotheosis of the protective system. It constitutes a Chinese wall which restricts trade and commerce, but it is a wall around a country with which we seek commercial relations. Where is the "home market," then, which has served as the battle cry for so many years of the Republican Party? The Senator from Massachusetts is now crying out for the markets of Great Britain. His position shows the fallacy of Republican protectionism.

But, Mr. President, I do not care to be led into a discussion of that question at this time. My information is that Great Britain, like our own country, has, as the result of the war, an accumulation of products purchased or made for war purposes and which must be disposed of quickly in order to prevent immense losses to the Governments holding the same. These accumulations, it is believed, can be absorbed within a very short time by the domestic trade, and Great Britain, France, and other belligerent nations are desirous of having a short "breathing space," if I may employ this term, to absorb these products. Our Government is in the same situation, but not to the same extent as Great Britain or France.

But we have hundreds of millions of pounds of wool, as well as other products, raw and manufactured, which we would be glad to absorb.

Let me call attention to a question familiar to all Senators which should be considered when we are impliedly criticizing Great Britain for her temporary policy of laying embargoes.

A few months before the armistice there was considerable anxiety over the scarcity of potash, chrome, manganese, pyrites, and other metals. The people of the West were importuned by the officials of the War and Interior Departments, as well as the War Industries Board, to develop mines and produce these metals, so imperatively needed for war purposes. In various parts of the country the patriotic people responded to these pleas, and at great expense and confronted with almost insurmountable obstacles they succeeded in producing great quantities of these metals.

The Government purchased but a fraction of the same, and the producers now have on hand these accumulations. When the armistice was declared the Government ceased purchasing. Spain produces pyrites much cheaper than we mined them during the war. She is anxious to ship her surplus pyrites to the United States. Brazil has great quantities of manganese, and desires this market for her surplus.

The same situation prevails with respect to long-staple cotton, to which the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] referred a few days ago, and in a modified form the wool presents a similar condition. Last year the wool men of the West were importuned not to dispose of their lambs or their ewes but to carry them over until this year, notwithstanding the high prices which they could have obtained for the same. The reason given was that we must have wool in order to supply our soldiers and sailors with needed supplies. The wool men patriotically kept their flocks and herds, and purchased corn and cottonseed meal and hay at very high prices in order to keep the sheep during the winter. Moreover, they employed labor at high prices, and entered upon the winter campaign of caring for their sheep under the war-price standards.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POINDEXTER. To add to the examples that the Senator from Utah has given I might mention the case of magnetite. In the State of Washington a great deposit of magnetite has been discovered, and in view of the representations of the administration and the purpose as a war industry large investments were made in the development of it. The people who made those investments are now prepared to furnish all the magnetite this country can consume. It is a material that is used in making fire-proof crucibles and linings of steel furnaces. The only competitor that they have is in the enemy country. The only other large deposit of magnetite which is capable of competing substantially with this industry in the State of Washington is a deposit in Austria.

Under all these circumstances, in view of the low wages paid in Austria compared with the high wages in the United States and the situation in which our investors find themselves, I am in

favor of continuing in effect for a reasonable length of time, in order to enable this industry to get on its feet, the embargo which is now in effect against the importation of magnetite from foreign countries.

Mr. KING. The example which the Senator has just given could be multiplied almost without limit. Potash furnishes another familiar illustration of conditions existing here, which find some parallel to the situation in Great Britain. Before the war we imported large quantities of potash from Germany. We needed it badly, and a number of loyal Americans made heavy expenditures at the earnest request—indeed, I might say the command—of various agencies and instrumentalities of the Government and have produced a very large supply. Now other countries seek to export their potash to the United States and sell at prices which would be ruinous to American producers.

Mr. President, the question arises, Shall we undertake in some way to offer some temporary relief to the Government and to those who have thus responded to the Nation's call? Shall we do as it is claimed England is doing—lay a temporary embargo upon those articles which were produced under the conditions, or similar ones, just referred to—in order that the holders of the products, whether the Government or private individuals, shall have an opportunity to dispose of the same in the domestic market? There would seem to be some justice in this course, otherwise the Government might be called upon to meet the loans, though there is perhaps only a moral obligation upon its part to pay the same, charging them as a part of the war costs. However, I am not pressing that question now and am not expressing a settled view as to the course to be pursued.

Many petitions have been addressed to the War Trade Board, the War Industries Board, the War Department, and other agencies of the Government praying for relief from the burdens which those who patriotically served the Nation in the manner above referred to now resting upon them. The War Trade Board has been literally besieged and demands have been made that an embargo for a limited period be placed upon the products which I have mentioned as well as many more, in order that an opportunity might be afforded for the domestic market to absorb these accumulated supplies. During the war we placed embargoes upon many articles and established a licensing system which greatly interrupted free commerce. After the armistice the embargo was continued for some time, and even now, I am told, it is continued to cover a considerable number of articles, or at least there are such impediments to exports and imports that as to some products it can be said there is an embargo.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to ask the Senator if he does not also believe that it will be necessary for us to maintain an embargo against Canadian grains being sold upon our market that we may be able to uphold the price which we have guaranteed for our grains, and can we make any complaint against another nation for doing exactly what we are bound to do?

Mr. KING. Obviously that is true, unless the Government is willing to lose hundreds of millions of dollars.

So, Mr. President, there are many of our own citizens asking our own Government to do just what the Senator from Massachusetts complains that England, in a modified form, has done or has suggested should be done. England has stated that it is not a permanent policy with her; that her present restrictive policy is not permanent, but only to enable her to absorb the accumulated stocks. Now, it is to be noted that the embargo is general. It even extends to the dominions under the British flag. There is no discrimination against this or any nation.

England could not maintain as a permanent policy the one now temporarily employed. Her position forbids it. The United States is in a much better position than is England to resort to embargoes and trade restrictions. Her manufacturing plants would soon starve and want and ruin would come to the people of Great Britain if she erected tariff walls against imports, particularly certain raw materials and agricultural products. We are in a better position, industrially and otherwise, to maintain embargoes and high tariffs than Great Britain. Please keep in view the point that I am not urging embargoes and high tariffs nor any trade policy or the economic fallacies of prohibitive tariffs. I am only calling attention to the facts which have influenced England's transient policy, and also to the fact that we are pursuing a similar course.

If the War Trade Board refuses to continue this policy, Congress may feel constrained to aid, by embargoes similar to those employed by England, those who have accumulated the surplus products mentioned.

If we pass this resolution, it will be construed by some as a criticism of England for doing just what we have done and are imploring our Government to continue to do. It seems to me it would be imprudent and unwise, in view of our situation, in view of the attitude which our Government is taking, for us to pass the resolution submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KING. I yield the floor. I do not want to take further time this morning.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have read the resolution, and I fail to find in it any criticism of the British Government. Will the Senator point out to me what language in the resolution he thinks is tantamount to a criticism of the British Government?

Mr. KING. When we ask our Department of State to request the British Government to modify or suspend such prohibition I think it might at this time be regarded as a complaint against England's policy, and an unwarranted interference with her domestic affairs. Of course, if conditions were normal, if we were not linked together as allies in a great war—and Senators will remember that technically we are still at war—a wholly different situation would then be presented. The State Department often takes up with foreign nations trade questions and seeks amelioration from trade conditions conceived to be harsh and oppressive to American manufacturers—exporters and importers.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Well—

Mr. KING. I am sure, if the Senator will pardon me, there are some among us who would regard it as an impertinence if in the Parliament of Great Britain there should be introduced a resolution of similar character inquiring of the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Commerce what steps had been taken with a view to ascertaining the policy of the American Government in respect to embargoes which had been placed upon the importation of articles into the United States.

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I call the Senator's attention to the fact—and I believe it is a fact—that last winter a department conducting international relations did request one nation to take up with another a question which concerns that nation, to see if it could not secure a modification of some contemplated action?

Mr. KING. I do not recall the matter; but the abnormal situation now, it seems to me, renders inapplicable the general rule to which the Senator has referred. We know that England is doing this only for a temporary purpose, as we are for a temporary purpose maintaining an embargo on a number of articles. It must be remembered that we laid an embargo first and are still continuing it in effect, to a limited extent at least, and I feel confident that insistent demands will be made by Americans for a more extensive application of the embargo until the present precarious industrial and economic condition has passed away.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator allow me to ask him how does he know that is true? Why not get this information? I do not understand that we express condemnation of what Great Britain is doing. We are simply seeking information.

Mr. KING. I know it, I think, from the same source the Senator from Massachusetts obtained his information—the public press—and that has stated very clearly, notably the New York Times, the purpose for which this was done and the limited object which it had in view.

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to ask the Senator a question, if he will allow me, because it is just in line with what he has said. The resolution asks the Secretary of State to inform the Senate "what steps, if any, have been taken by the Department of State to request the British Government to modify or suspend such prohibition." If that means anything, it means that we ought to ask Great Britain to suspend such prohibition. It is an invitation, at least, to do it. I think the Senator is absolutely right when he says that it is a matter of impertinence, and we would regard it as such if Great Britain should so speak of any tariff levy that we might make.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, it is not so much the expression of views in the resolution that might be claimed to be disagreeable, not to say offensive, but the implication is unfortunate, in my judgment, and the discussion that has taken place on the resolution has been still more unfortunate. The Senator from Utah referred to an editorial in the New York Times. I do not know whether he mentioned it in detail or not.

Mr. KING. No; I did not.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have before me an editorial in the New York Times of February 3 which seems to be quite pertinent, and especially the portion of it which I will read:

The guardians of American interests who discover enmity in the embargo placed on our exports at the week end are under equal necessity to remark the friendship shown in the removal of that embargo in November. The fire eaters in the commercial war should remark that the embargo placed on our goods was also placed on Canadian goods,

and for the same reason. England must have time to arrange payments for the goods dumped upon her under her liberality toward trade; it is troublesome to maintain the rate of exchange at the figure which is desirable in the interest of all.

I think we must recognize conditions over there as well as here.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I do not know that I am not willing to recognize conditions in Great Britain. I do not know enough about this matter to state whether I do or not. I did not obtain my information from the public press about it, but I obtained it from those whose industries were being affected by it. While I knew there were some people in this country who were not giving any attention to our own domestic affairs or the reasonable promotion of our interests, or the interests of our people, I am surprised to see Senators rise in their places on this floor and urge that we give no attention to our industries; that we make no provision for the employment of our idle labor; or that we in every way neglect those matters which we are in Washington to represent.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WEEKS. I will yield for a moment.

Mr. KING. I want to ask the Senator if in the criticism which he has just made he was leveling those remarks at anything submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] or myself, because the question of idle labor was not suggested, and the question of failing to look after our domestic interests was certainly not suggested. On the contrary, I was insisting that we were looking after our domestic interests, and the policy of the Senator from Massachusetts was a negation of that policy.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, the question of idle labor was not mentioned, but the question of idle labor is involved. If we are to have an embargo placed upon the products of our manufacturing industries, it is going to lessen to that extent the amount of work our people can do in this country, and Senators will find that there will be a demand, and a positive demand, in my judgment, from the industries in their own States that they be not impaired by any such action.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WEEKS. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Does the Senator take the position that if the Government of Great Britain, in the management of its own affairs, tries to place an embargo upon importations into that country, and that embargo applies to all the world alike, and there is no discrimination against the United States—

Mr. WEEKS. I know it. I so stated yesterday.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Does the Senator feel that it is proper for the Government of the United States to question the action of Great Britain in that regard?

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I think it proper for the State Department to inform the Senate what information it has on that subject, and whether it has contemplated taking any action which will modify this condition.

Mr. President, I want to say one word further in reference to a comment made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING]. He said the Senator from Massachusetts is a member of a party which advocates embargoes and prohibitive tariffs, and all that sort of thing. I wish to say that I never voted for or advocated an embargo or never voted for or advocated a prohibitive tariff; but I want to hold out this warning signal to the Senator from Utah and all other Senators. Under the conditions which prevail in this country the probabilities are that every patriotic man will find it necessary, in order to protect our labor, to vote for a higher tariff than the Republican Party has ever advocated. It is in sight, and the time has come when we have got to protect our domestic interests; and, unless we do, we are going to have a continuance of matters that are brought to the attention of the Senate every morning—of men out of work, of strikes, and disorders of various kinds. We have got to give that matter our first attention, and one of the actions which may properly be taken is to obtain this information from the State Department.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Massachusetts. The resolution he asks us to pass does not criticize the action of Great Britain. It does not condemn it. It is a resolution which seeks information.

Now, a most important interference with our commerce has taken place by the embargo placed upon us by Great Britain. It may be all right; when we hear the facts we may conclude that it is in line with action we ourselves will take to protect some of our industries; but so important an act, reaching to such an extent against our industries, ought not to pass unstudied; it ought not to pass without official consideration. It may be that we will place an embargo on Canadian wheat. Does anyone doubt, if we do so, that Great Britain would inquire about it?

No important act takes place here affecting the commerce of Great Britain that is not very carefully considered by her Government.

Mr. President, I like the idea of our watching the business interests of our country. I believe it is our duty to study not only our industries resulting from manufacture but the products of our soil; I believe it is our duty to watch our foreign markets; and I am glad to join the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] in supporting a resolution indicating the duty on the part of the Senate at least to ask for information with reference to the serious interference with our foreign markets. There are markets that I am interested in, or in which my immediate constituents are interested, which are closed. My views upon that subject are not limited to my immediate constituents, although I may know more about their interests than I do of those of New England. I readily support a resolution looking to an inquiry with reference to the industries of New England as to those of any other part of the country. I believe we should realize that, if our foreign commerce is to be properly guarded, it must require from us and from the administration thoughtful and constant attention.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. President, if I fancied from the reading of the resolution now before the Senate that it could even be considered by the Government of Great Britain as a criticism of this Government upon its purely internal policy, or a criticism by the Senate upon an act of Great Britain without even investigation, however much it might be presumed to be against our interests, I would move to lay the resolution on the table and would do all I could to see that success followed my motion.

But, Mr. President, I am impelled to the view that what the eminent Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] has said and what the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has said will either be justified completely or to their own minds disclosed to be without foundation when they have heard from the Secretary of State, in response to the resolution, just what are the facts.

I take it, sir, that the resolution has no other purpose than to ask of our own Secretary of State as to any steps taken by that department as to the two things, either the modification or the suspension of any part of the embargo. If nothing has been done, that is the response; if anything has been done, then a description of it; that is the response.

Mr. President, I wish for myself to say that I trust that in these discussions no national prejudices shall ever cloud the fair presentation of an economic question. Britain has a right to her economic policy, and no ancient prejudices or, indeed, present political grievances, if such existed, should be urged in this body to wrongly color or to influence wrongful accusation against her. She has a right to whatever policy she wishes to undertake. We have a right to whatever policy we shall undertake. So, as the resolution merely inquires of our Secretary of State for information for the benefit of the body, I am unable to see that the strictures of the eminent Senators are appropriate. It is only because it is an inquiry addressed to our own Government for information that I give it my support.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, just a word. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] yesterday regarded the action of Great Britain in laying a temporary embargo as of great importance; indeed, as I understood him, he felt that perhaps this was the beginning of a trade war, and in the closing sentence of the Senator's speech he practically told Great Britain to beware of the War of 1812. He evidently regarded the conduct of Great Britain as provocative of criticism, and possibly as the beginning of an economic war and fierce rivalry between the two nations; and possibly, because of the warning note that he sounded, he regarded the action of Great Britain in laying this embargo as a grievance that might result in either trade wars or possibly in a more serious controversy. Certainly if England so intends this policy, then she might regard our questioning her policy as a criticism, in view of the fact that we began the practice and are not yet free from it. However, I have no such idea concerning England's attitude toward the United States. She wants the most cordial and friendly relations with this Government and with the American people. She expects to be and will continue to be our most valued foreign purchaser.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] adjures us to look after our business interests and domestic affairs. In his earnest appeal we all join. It is important that every possible course be adopted to increase our trade and commerce. Our Nation can not live only for herself. Important as is our home market, we must find in the world around us markets for billions of dollars of products annually. Our prosperity depends upon this.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, if this resolution only inquired for information, as seems to be assumed by those who have supported it, possibly there would be no serious objection to it; but the resolution goes much further than that. It reads:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested to inform the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, what steps, if any, have been taken by the Department of State to request the British Government to modify or suspend such prohibition.

That is not a request for information as to the facts, as to the conditions upon which this embargo was based, but it is a request for information as to what action has been taken by the Secretary of State to carry out a policy in opposition to the policy which has been decreed by Great Britain in this matter.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator from Washington that if no action has been taken the reply would be to that effect, and if some action has been taken it would outline the course which the State Department had followed in the matter. It does not commit the Senate to anything, but it merely asks for information as to what the State Department has done, if anything, with relation to the embargo which is being placed upon American and other products.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I think it would be much more dignified, if I may use that word, for the Senate to announce some policy of its own in a matter of this kind, instead of merely seeking to ascertain whether the Secretary of State has undertaken to mark out a policy for the American Government in opposition to the deliberate action of the Government of Great Britain in a matter so important as an embargo undoubtedly is.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, may I suggest to the Senator that it would be a difficult matter for us to adopt a policy which Congress should follow until we have all the facts relating to the case? Presumably we may get some facts from the State Department on which we can base a policy.

Mr. POINDEXTER. As I understand, the resolution contains an implication that the Secretary of State ought to have taken some action of this kind. That necessarily would be implied.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. Does the Senator wish to imply that there would be any impropriety in the Secretary of State taking such action or making an inquiry of the British Government to that effect?

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is a matter of opinion, a matter of policy. In answer to the Senator I will say that my own personal opinion is that it would be a mistaken policy for the Secretary of State to make such inquiries, unless he is in possession of information that has not been presented to the Senate as to the nature of the embargo. The mere fact that Great Britain has laid an embargo upon certain importations certainly is not sufficient ground for the Government of the United States to put itself in opposition to that policy and to take official action to oppose a policy which Great Britain has a perfect right to adopt, and which she has applied to all the world without discrimination.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, if that is so, then the unbroken policy of the State Department has been improper and groundless, because it has been the continuous policy of the State Department, as I know from personal experience, to keep watch over all governmental action of the kind here described, and to instruct our diplomatic representatives in the various foreign capitals to take immediate steps in protestation against governmental action which may be detrimental to the extension of our foreign trade. I happen to have passed through some episodes of that kind myself, where, by the interposition of the State Department, I was instructed not only to make representations at the foreign office, but to use minatory language toward the government to which I was accredited in cases exactly like this. The archives of the State Department and the archives of every diplomatic commission of the United States in foreign countries are full of instances of that kind, and the unbroken policy of the State Department has been certainly to take immediate action in such cases. The resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts simply asks what has been done under the policy which we know to have existed for a long time in the State Department.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I thought the Senator rose merely to ask a question. I might comment on the fact that the case which he has in mind, if I am correctly informed, where the Senator, at that time occupying a diplomatic position under the Government, was instructed to use minatory language, was the case of a small, weak country.

The Senator was never instructed to use minatory language toward a great power such as Great Britain. That has been

quite a marked line of demarcation in the foreign policy, I may say in the recent years, during the present administration, of the Government of the United States. We pursue quite a different policy toward Costa Rica and Haiti from the policy we followed upon the sinking of the *Lusitania* by the German Empire. There is quite a marked distinction; because when the Senator who now graces a seat in this body from the State of New Hampshire was minister to Greece he was instructed to use minatory language on account of some action which Greece had taken—which I presume it was entirely within the rights of Greece to take—I am somewhat surprised to note the suggestion apparently implied in his remarks that the Secretary of State would be exercising a wise discretion to use minatory language in this case toward the Empire of Great Britain.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President, the mere fact that the policy of using minatory language was applied to a small government does not change the principle of the thing at all. The fact is that the policy of the State Department has been to protest—I suppose the instructions to its diplomatic representatives were couched in different terms, according to the conditions at the seat of government where the representative was a resident—but the policy and the practice have remained exactly the same, that wherever action was taken in a legislative body or by ministerial decree which threatened the market for American products our diplomatic representatives have been instructed to make representations; and in many cases it will be found from a reading of the dispatches that the diplomatic representatives did not wait for instructions, but, knowing that to be the policy of the State Department, have made their representations to the foreign office in advance of any instructions from Washington. The resolution of the Senator from Massachusetts, as I gather its sense, merely asks what has been done.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I decline to yield to the Senator now for a speech.

Mr. MOSES. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will take my seat in just a moment.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Washington a question?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Yes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not understand the word which the Senator used. Is it "miniature" language, or what is it? I did not quite catch it.

Mr. POINDEXTER. It sounds very much like that word. I was only quoting the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Well, does the Senator understand what the word means? I am at a loss to know.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think a great deal of "miniature" language has been used. I think the Senator knows what that means. It means just the opposite, however, of what the Senator from New Hampshire undoubtedly described by the word "minatory."

There is not any doubt at all, Mr. President, that the President of the United States has, in the absence of legislation, the initiative in conducting the foreign affairs of the country, and the Secretary of State is exercising part of the powers that are vested by the Constitution in the executive branch of the Government. Under him are the ambassadors, the ministers, and consular agents; but the question of the mere propriety or legality of an action is a very different thing from the question of the wisdom of it or the propriety of it, if you use the word "propriety" in the sense of whether or not it is a wise policy.

I want to say in regard to the action of Great Britain and of France, which I have heard criticized a good deal in recent weeks in several different particulars, that in cases where they were exercising that prerogative of a people to take care of their own interests, I have rather admired them for it, even in cases where the action was more or less detrimental to certain interests in the United States. It is highly desirable, also, that we should protect our interests. I admire Great Britain for taking the step if it tends to protect her business interests. It might be that when we know what the facts are, after we have had an opportunity to examine the case, the Senate would decide that the United States would be justified in requesting Great Britain to modify her attitude, because of its injurious effects upon the industries of the United States. But I do not think we ought to take such action, either expressly or by implication, unless we are sure that we are justified in doing it, and that the interests involved are of sufficient importance to cause us to question for a moment such steps as Great Britain has seen fit to take within her legal rights, without discrimination against the United States, to foster her interests. That is especially true because of the situation in which Great Britain finds herself at the end of a four years' struggle for her exist-

ence, when her resources have been taxed to the utmost; when her industries have been absorbed in the manufacture of munitions, have been dislocated, and in many instances destroyed; when her economic situation has been revolutionized; when supplies have been accumulated; and when new means for readjusting industrial life may be found necessary.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WEEKS. I think I have something of the same sentiment with regard to what Great Britain is trying to do in protecting the interests of her own people; and it is the unanimous sentiment of the business interests of Great Britain that such a course should be taken. I have not seen a single statement for months which has not been along that line.

If the Senator will pardon me for just a minute, I want to read—for I have in my hands an account of the meeting of the Bradford Dyers' Association—something that was stated two years ago by the president of that association in connection with the trade conditions. He says:

In conclusion, may I be permitted to say that in my opinion the greatest hope for the future lies in our ceasing to act in the interests of party or class, and in the recognition that after the war we should be ready and determined to judge every question from the standpoint of imperial interests only. The problems which will confront us after the war are such as seem to demand a government representative of all parties and classes, devoting its attention almost entirely to the effective organization of all the resources of the Empire.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I think Great Britain is justified in such action as that; and, looking upon her conduct in as impartial a spirit as possible, I admire the wisdom of her government in taking such steps to enable her industries to recuperate from the exhaustion of this war. I am informed that both France and Great Britain have been prudent and diligent during the war in preparing for the continuation of their foreign trade and commerce and their domestic industry at the close of the war. In that respect they compare very favorably with the United States; and the comparison is to the disadvantage of the United States, because we have neglected what they have diligently sought.

I noticed a few days ago that representatives of the administration, representatives of the Federal Trade Commission, were speaking in different parts of the country urging the American people not to seek to acquire foreign trade in competition with France and Great Britain, saying that it would be taking advantage of our allies in their exhaustion after this great war; that we ought not to interfere with the foreign trade of our competitors. From other sources in the administration, from the highest sources, we have seen statements that the United States ought not to profit by this war; that we ought not to come out of the war with any advantage—an altruism that is almost superhuman—the argument that although we have been forced into a great war by Germany, although we have exhausted our resources in the defense of our institutions and of the lives and rights of American citizens, though we are right and our enemy wrong, we should not ask for reparation or for indemnities. Our allies are asking for them; but those who are in control of the American Government are set in their policy that the United States, which shared the expense and the sacrifices, shall ask for no indemnity.

Mr. President, there is no idealism that is worthy of the name, there is no spiritual development that is admirable, that has not its foundation in material things. You can not develop the mind and the morals of a man unless he has some of the material necessities and comforts of life. You have to minister to the physical prosperity and well-being of a nation in order to build upon that foundation any sort of spiritual exaltation, or this ideal spirit of altruism that now seems to govern our affairs. We ought to look out for our interests. France and Great Britain are justified in looking out for theirs, and I think that before we pass this resolution, asking the Secretary of State if he has protested against this embargo, we ought to inquire into the conditions and satisfy ourselves whether he would be justified, under the circumstances, in interfering with this action of Great Britain in the management of her own affairs.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I see no reason why we should not ask for the information as proposed in this resolution; and, so far as I am concerned, I am going to support it.

I am only going to speak because of some observations made by Senators who apparently fear that the passage of this resolution might militate against some contemplated action on the part of the Government hereafter that they may think would be desirable to protect the potash manufacturers and the wheat growers.

It seems to me that it is about time that it is understood in the United States of America that the Government is not going to guarantee a price of \$2.26 a bushel for the entire wheat crop

of 1919, when the winter crop had not all been planted to the date the armistice was signed, and of spring wheat one-half the entire crop has not been planted yet, and when neither of the crops will be harvested under the same conditions that existed when this guaranty was proposed, before the war ended.

I am not at all in favor of these embargoes and restrictions talked about here, and that are expected, on the part of the Government, to protect one part of the people of the United States at the expense of all who must eat in this country of ours; I am not in favor of such a policy at all. If these potash manufacturers, who have been spoken of here as having made potash at the request of the Government at a great loss to themselves, were encouraged by the Government to do that under such conditions that the Government ought to pay them for any loss they may sustain, it is well to have the Government do it, and not to levy a burden upon all who must use potash in production of crops in this country in order that it may be done; and the same thing is true about this wheat crop. Not half of it has been planted yet, and it will all be harvested under entirely different conditions than those existing at the first planting even, and the Government ought not to be expected, under such conditions, to make all the people who must eat pay prices of this sort hereafter for the benefit of wheat growers.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware will state it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I desire to inquire what disposition was made of the amendment offered by the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The third section of the preamble, the Chair is informed, was stricken out.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I should not have been greatly surprised if I had heard the voice of a free trader strongly in support of this resolution; but I confess it does surprise me somewhat to find a dyed-in-the-wool protectionist offering a resolution that does, no matter how much we may put on the soft pedal, criticize another Government for adopting a policy of protection to its own citizens.

Whatever you can say of this resolution, it is a resolution inviting the Secretary of State to inquire for a purpose, and that purpose is to request the British Government to modify or suspend this prohibition. What right has the legislative assembly or Congress or Parliament of one country to request of another country that it modify its own domestic policy with reference to importations? What would be the sentiment of the United States Congress if the British Parliament should introduce and pass a resolution protesting against a tariff levied by the American Congress? We would resent it, and we would resent it, I think, truthfully and earnestly.

If the Senator from Massachusetts should simply inquire of the Secretary of State what steps he had taken to meet any condition that was against our interests, or what inquiry he had made, it would present an entirely different question; but this, Mr. President, is not an inquiry for the purpose of determining what Great Britain has done or purposes to do. It is simply an inquiry to determine why we have not protested against the action of the British Government. For my part I do not consider it a very appropriate thing to do, especially in the face of the fact that we as Republicans, we as protectionists, are in favor of levying such a prohibitive tariff as will enable the American producer to produce anything that can be produced in the United States as against any foreign competition.

We have seen the prices of dyestuffs mount some thousand per cent in a very few months on account of this war. We are now, starting in this country the manufacture of dyestuffs to supply the American manufacturer of cotton and silken fabrics. I hope that we will put a duty on dyestuffs sufficiently large to enable the American producer to get on his feet; and I would not care, Mr. President, if it went so far as to operate as an absolute prohibition of any importation.

Again, for the purpose of prosecuting our war, which we expected in all probability might last over another year, and to secure food for ourselves and our allies, we voted, by a very large majority, at least, that we would fix the price of bread and flour for the next year considerably above the market price. Now, there is just one way in which we can maintain that. I do not care whether we maintain it by a direct congressional embargo or under the system of a license now adopted. We will keep out Australian wheat, we will keep out Canadian wheat, during the year 1919. Then why may we not expect a protest from Canada against such an embargo? Would the Canadian Parliament for a moment think of questioning our right to place an embargo, under the conditions, against Canadian grain?

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. McCUMBER. Here is a little country, one-third the size of the State of Minnesota, with 35,000,000 people to take care of. She must import everything upon which she places the hand of labor from every section of the earth, and then reexport it again from Great Britain. With her very life depending upon her ability to manufacture and to give work to her labor, we criticize her; and I am not saying that so much in reference to the Senator's resolution as in reference to the remarks which were made yesterday, in which we threatened that she would meet the spirit of 1812 if she dared to place an embargo against the importation of articles into Great Britain, while she must do so in order to protect her own citizens.

I for one, Mr. President, protest against our criticizing any nation that is doing exactly the same thing that we have been doing in the past and that we shall be compelled to do in the future.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCUMBER. Pardon me; I yield to the Senator from Illinois, who first rose.

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish to inquire if the Senator does not think the billion and a half recommended by the late Secretary of the Treasury to establish credits for the purchase of raw materials might not have prompted a spirit of gratitude on the part of Great Britain?

Mr. McCUMBER. The question answers itself. I yield now to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. I do not know that finally I will be in a position to criticize Great Britain for the action which has been taken, but the Senator from North Dakota very truly says they are trying to protect their industries and keep their people employed. I said two or three times that very action prevents us from employing our people in this country. When I see men walking the streets in the Massachusetts shoe cities because the trade with Europe has been cut off, the million dollars of business we were doing in that line with Great Britain was stopped suddenly two years ago, and the embargo has not been removed, I say that I prefer, if one is necessary, to see the workmen of Great Britain walking the streets rather than the workmen in this country.

Mr. McCUMBER. Let me answer the Senator. When we put 60, 70, and 100 per cent duty on woolen goods we did not ask the question whether as a result of that it would compel British workmen to walk the streets. We were looking after American interests. I agree with the Senator. We are both good protectionists. I believe in protecting our people, but I do not believe in criticizing another country for doing exactly the same thing that we are doing.

Mr. WEEKS. The Senator from North Dakota is far too keen a man not to see the difference between prohibition and protection. This embargo is prohibition. It stops all trade.

Mr. McCUMBER. So an embargo against wheat will be a prohibition. It will stop all importations of wheat and we have got to stop it all from coming into this country?

Mr. REED. Why?

Mr. McCUMBER. Simply because we have so provided in our law, as a war measure.

Mr. REED. That wheat shall not be shipped in?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. REED. Where is that clause in the law?

Mr. McCUMBER. I will tell the Senator where the clause is. We have done this: We have provided that we will fix the price—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is House bill 13308.

Mr. WEEKS. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may go over without prejudice.

Mr. POMERENE. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made, and the resolution will go to the calendar.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. When the Senate adjourned yesterday evening we were considering an amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] to the committee amendment inserting section 6. That amendment is now before the Senate, I understand.

Mr. KELLOGG. If the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads will listen to me for a moment, that amendment was offered for printing and to lie on the table. I should like to offer an amendment to section 6, which has been printed for several days, if the Senator does not object at this time. I do not think there is any serious objection to the amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I have no objection in the world to the amendment. I think it is a very proper one.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] to the amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. In section 6, page 37, line 13, after the word "act" insert the following proviso:

*Provided, That where the constitution of any State prohibits the same from engaging upon internal improvements, or from contracting public debts for extraordinary purposes in an amount sufficient to meet the monetary requirements of the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, or restricts annual tax levies for the purpose of constructing and improving roads and bridges, and where a constitutional alteration or amendment to overcome either or all of such prohibitions must be submitted to a referendum at a general election, the sum to which such State is entitled under the method of apportionment provided in the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, shall be withdrawn by the Secretary of the Treasury from the principal fund appropriated by the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, upon receipt of the certification of the governor of such State to the existence of either or all of said prohibitions, and such sum shall be carried by the Secretary of the Treasury as a separate fund for future disbursement as hereinafter provided: *Provided further, That when, by referendum, the constitutional alterations or amendments necessary to the enjoyment of the sum so withdrawn have been approved and ratified by any State, the Secretary of the Treasury, upon receipt of certification from the governor of such State to such effect, shall immediately make available to such State, for the purposes set forth in the act of July 11, 1916, or any act amendatory thereof, the sum withdrawn as hereinbefore provided: And provided further, That nothing herein shall be deemed to prevent any State from receiving such portion of said principal sum as is available under its existing constitution and laws.**

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I have submitted this amendment to the chairman and several members of the committee, and I am informed by the members of the committee that it is entirely satisfactory. There are two or three States, I am informed by the road department, which have a provision in their constitutions, some of which are now being amended, which would prohibit them from taking advantage of the full amount of this appropriation, and the object is simply that so much thereof as can not be taken advantage of immediately shall be set aside by the Treasury and not paid over to the State until the constitutions are amended. That is the condition in my own State, where a constitutional amendment is being submitted at this time. I understand the chairman has no objection to this amendment.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think it is a proper amendment.

Mr. SWANSON. It can not be adopted at present, because the amendment I offered to the amendment must be disposed of first.

Mr. KELLOGG. I understood that the amendment of the committee is subject to amendment now.

Mr. SWANSON. The amendment I offered yesterday has not been disposed of.

Mr. KELLOGG. I offered this amendment before the Senator from Virginia offered his amendment, and it has been lying on the table.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Virginia allow me? This amendment is to the same section as the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection to the amendment. I think it ought to be adopted.

Mr. KELLOGG. The Senator does not object to its being considered at this time?

Mr. SWANSON. But when the Senate adjourned yesterday my amendment was under consideration and it should be disposed of. I think there is no objection to my amendment, which was under consideration when the Senate adjourned, and it should be disposed of first.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the parliamentary situation is that the amendment of the Senator from Virginia was pending at the time the Senate adjourned, and therefore it is in order at this time.

Mr. KELLOGG. Then I offer this as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. SWANSON. I have no objection to it.

Mr. LENROOT. I wish to ask the Senator whether the language of his amendment would not prevent a State from receiving any of this money where under its constitution it would be entitled to receive and expend a portion of it, but not to the amount that is provided in the bill?

Mr. KELLOGG. No; I have added a proviso. A proviso at the end takes care of that. The State may receive any sum which it can under its constitution allow.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator offers his amendment, I understand, to the amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia. That would be an amendment in the third degree. The amendment of the Senator from Virginia is an amendment to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. KELLOGG. Then I will withdraw my amendment for the present.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is withdrawn. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Virginia to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. VARDAMAN. I ask that the amendment to the amendment be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. At the end of line 15, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following words:

Provided, That so much of the appropriation apportioned to any State under the said act approved July 11, 1916, or under this section, for any fiscal year as remains unexpended at the close thereof shall be available for expenditure in that State until the close of the second fiscal year succeeding the close of the fiscal year for which such apportionment was made, except that amounts apportioned for any fiscal year to any State which has not a State highway department shall be available for expenditure in that State until the close of the third fiscal year succeeding the close of the fiscal year for which such apportionment was made.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I am opposed to this amendment. I do not think it ought to be adopted. The only justification that we have for making these tremendous appropriations for roads at this time is to take care of unemployment that exists or may exist throughout the country. This amendment changes the existing law in this respect. The present law provides that if the amount allotted to a State is not expended by the State during the year for which it is allotted it may be carried into the next fiscal year. In other words, it gives a State two years in which to expend the money that is allotted to it under the law. The pending amendment proposes to extend that one year and give them three years in which to expend this money.

Mr. President, what is the situation before us? In view of the condition of the Treasury, it seems so plain that Congress ought not to be making appropriations for unnecessary improvements, desirable though they may be, unless it be for the purpose of taking care of unemployment. I believe that is necessary. I believe an appropriation for roads is one of the best means we can use for taking care of this unemployment. But, Mr. President, this appropriation ought not to be considered as a grab bag by each State to get its share, and if it does not use it now, when unemployment exists, that it may use it two or three years later.

It ought to be treated as an unemployment question. That is not a local question. That is a national question. If we have 500,000 unemployed men walking the streets in three States like Illinois, New York, and Pennsylvania, that is not a local question to those three States. The unemployment of that half-million men affects every State in the Union, and we ought to take care of that unemployment in some such way as this. So I am in favor of appropriating \$100,000,000, \$125,000,000, or \$200,000,000, if necessary, for the purpose of taking care of this unemployment and at the same time receiving a benefit in the way of improved roads in this country.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. I am impressed by what the Senator from Wisconsin says about the necessity for taking care of unemployment. May I ask him to give me his opinion of the proviso at the end of this section, to which it is now sought to add a second proviso? I have reference to the proviso which provides that preference shall be given to honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines. Is it not a fact that if there were 500,000 men who are now unemployed, with the exception of a small percentage they are soldiers, sailors, and marines?

Mr. LENROOT. I think that is true. I do not think the proviso, so far as unemployment is concerned, will be very material, although I see no harm in it. I take it for granted that, in so far as employment can be provided, private industry is going to give preference to our returned soldiers and sailors. But, aside from the question of providing employment, how can these appropriations be justified?

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKellar] said yesterday, when he was asked where we would get the money to pay these vast appropriations, "We will take it out of the profiteers." I

wish to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that in the revenue bill, the conference report of which will soon be presented, the Democratic side of this aisle unanimously voted to reduce for 1920 the excess-profits tax, thereby reducing the revenue \$2,000,000,000. I wish to call the attention of that side of the aisle to the fact that while the provisions they have made for 1920 will bring only a revenue of \$4,000,000,000, the estimates made now, not including appropriations of this character for 1920, amount to \$8,000,000,000.

Where are we going to get the money? Are we going to continue to vote bond issues in time of peace? If not, where is the money coming from? The eminent chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was asked that question the other day, and this was his reply:

Mr. KING. Has the committee having this bill in charge taken into account the ways and means by which the revenue is to be obtained to meet these rapidly increasing expenditures?

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the business of the Ways and Means Committee of the House and the Finance Committee of the Senate. They will attend to that.

According to the Senator's idea there is no responsibility upon Senators and Members of Congress who are not members of the Finance Committee or the Committee on Ways and Means with reference to the expenditures of the Government; "they will attend to that."

Mr. President, one of the reasons why the party on that side of the aisle will be in the minority instead of the majority soon is just because of that attitude upon their part, not only now but in the past, treating the United States Treasury as one of boundless resource, seeking to get all the dollars they can get for their own States, irrespective of the national needs or of the condition of the Treasury as a whole.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKellar in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. LENROOT. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. I am in full sympathy with the Senator's criticism, but I am unable to perceive any difference, either of opinion or conduct, on this question on either side of the Chamber.

Mr. LENROOT. There is this difference, I may say, and I called attention to it a moment ago: While that side of the aisle is continuing and proposing tremendous appropriations, that side of the aisle is attempting to fix a fiscal policy for 1920 reducing the revenues of the Government \$2,000,000,000. That side of the aisle is responsible for that and not this side.

Mr. THOMAS. That is true, Mr. President. This side of the aisle at present is in charge of such legislation. Nevertheless, I believe the amount of revenue which we propose to raise by that bill is just as much as the business and producing energies of the country now can stand; and I do not believe after the Senator's party comes into power it will augment the amount of revenue very much by additional revenue bills.

I may also say that members of the Finance Committee representing the other side of the Chamber, where there was no partisanship, so far as the discussion of items of the bill was concerned, were quite as willing to consider and act upon the proposed reductions as members upon this side.

Mr. LENROOT. I am very glad the Senator from Colorado does not at all agree with the chairman of the committee that we may go on and make these endless appropriations and trust to the Finance Committee of the Senate to find the revenue.

Mr. THOMAS. I said so the other day—I think Saturday morning—and expressed myself along that line as well as I could.

Mr. LENROOT. I am fully in accord with what the Senator from Colorado stated the other day.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator if American industry is at such a low ebb that it can not give employment to the hundreds of thousands of men, how that American industry, through an income tax or any other kind of tax, is going to pay for the enormous additional expense of cutting down hills and digging up trees by the roots?

Mr. LENROOT. I can not answer the question. The Senator should address his question to some one upon the other side of the aisle, who is taking the position that we can make appropriations in unlimited amounts and still the revenue in some way will be forthcoming to meet them.

I wish to say again that I believe it is necessary to provide for unemployment during the next year. I believe that the improvement of roads is one of the best means which can be found to take care of that unemployment, because in the building of roads we have as high a percentage of labor cost as in any other public work in which we might engage.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I ask the Senator does he not think there is a much better way, and that is to take such action as will put our industries on a prosperous course and allow the industries to earn money and to give the employment?

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator from North Dakota knows even much better than I that between now and the 4th of March it will be impossible for Congress to legislate in any such way as that. He knows it will not be done, and the fact that there ought to be legislation, in which I fully concur, does not excuse Congress if it shall fail to do what it can temporarily do to take care of this unemployment.

One of the reasons given by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] for the introduction of this amendment was that there were some legislatures which would not be in session this year, and the States would not, therefore, be able to take advantage of this appropriation, and therefore it should be extended so that those States in which the legislature does not meet this year might later on avail themselves of the appropriation.

Mr. President, in this crisis of the country if there is any State in the Union whose legislature is not willing to be called in special session by their governor to do their part toward meeting this situation, instead of saying to Uncle Sam, "We think you ought to do it all," that State is not entitled to a dollar of these appropriations. Each State ought to assume at least a portion of the burden of solving these questions, and it ought not all to be left to the National Government. I would say that any State which has an unemployment situation, or any State which has problems of readjustment, if their legislature will not meet in special session and avail themselves of this appropriation, if it shall be made, is not entitled to any appropriation at all. On the other hand, if the amendment be adopted we will find this situation in those States undoubtedly. They will take the position, "the building of roads costs more now than it will a year or two from now, so we will not build roads in this State now. We have the money from Uncle Sam. We will let it pile up, and we will wait two or three years and get it then, when we can build more roads for the same amount of money than we can build to-day."

Oh, Mr. President, it can not be justified, and this appropriation can not be justified for a single moment, except alone upon the theory of providing for unemployment.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I am for this appropriation because I believe it is a wise policy. It should be a national law. Travel is national, State, and local. Travel being national, State, and local, the appropriations for road improvements should be similar.

England has had a system, local in character, as suggested by some Senators, for centuries. She would never have builded such roads as she now has had she left the local settlement of the question to the counties and local authorities there. When she appropriated money out of the national treasury to aid the local, England began to have a splendid system of roads. France had a similar experience. There has been good improvement in those States where the State has aided the local authorities. When the Federal Government has a vast travel over State roads, it is but right that it should pay its part of the burden.

Congress appropriates vast sums a year to carry mail over the railroads, and yet when you come to carry mail over the post roads a great many people do not want to pay anything for that privilege. If it is right to pay to carry mail over the railroads, it is right and proper to pay a just and fair sum to improve the roads that the Federal Government uses for its mail. It is strange some people will antagonize every proposition to pay for carrying mail over country roads and yet never offer any antagonism to paying for carrying mail over the railroads.

If there ever was a time when this Government can afford to go into road building it is now. We have millions and hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of material in the Army and Navy that could be utilized for this purpose—trucks, road-building material, and machinery of all kinds—which will be wasted and useless unless this appropriation is made and that material made available and turned over to the Federal and State Governments, thus permitting the Federal Government to do its part in constructing these roads.

It is a wise national policy. It is a policy that the country is entitled to have.

The same antagonism was offered to the rural delivery, the same criticism was made, the same objection was made that is now offered to road improvement. I was a Member of the House and was on the first committee which reported the first \$10,000 for rural delivery. We were antagonized for contending for rural delivery, as we are now for insisting on national

aid to public roads. It grew. It had a hard and strenuous fight, but to-day nothing has done more for the country than rural delivery, and there is nothing to the repeal of which there would be more objection than the great system of rural delivery.

What is this amendment of mine? Under the present law, if the money is not made use of by the local authorities or State authorities the succeeding year it is divided among all the other States. This is an increased appropriation that is being made, and some of the State legislatures are not in session. You would have to call them suddenly into session in order to avail themselves of this money. This amendment provides that if the money shall not be used in the succeeding fiscal year it may be used in the second fiscal year in order that a great many of the States in which the legislatures are not now meeting may have time to meet and provide for this matter.

It seems to me to be but right that the States should have this opportunity to get their part of this appropriation. I think it helps to give employment, but I am not for this legislation solely because it gives employment. I favor it as a national system of road improvement. I believe we will never have a fine, good, splendid system of national roads until the Federal Government, the State government, and the local communities bear a just and fair share of the burden.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President—

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. The Senator has just stated that the Government has millions of dollars' worth of equipment that it might utilize for this purpose. I wish to ask the Senator whether it is not a fact that under the bill and under the law now existing the Government could not use a single truck for the purpose of constructing these roads?

Mr. SWANSON. This bill turns over to be used on these roads such material as the War Department will not need in the Army to be used in road construction. There is an amendment carrying that. I think if there ever was a time when the National Government can start on this work efficiently, start on it well, it is this time. You will have a great many engineers and a great many people who have been employed on road construction for the Army and for the Navy in France and here, and if there ever was a time when the Government could economically and well enter upon a national policy of the constructing of public roads now is a good time.

This amendment is not material, but it does seem to me to be just. The latter part of it provides something with reference to States which have not highway commissions. I think every State now has a highway commission. That is simply carrying out the provisions of the law which existed before. I am willing for that portion to be eliminated.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. I desire to ask the Senator a question for information. The Senator has stated that these roads are all national roads. Well, that is true in my own State and in every Northern State of which I know. One can there go anywhere and use the public roads; but I find that if I go down the Shenandoah Valley I have to pay 5 cents a mile for driving over the public road; at least, that has been my experience in the last few years, though I do not know whether or not that has been the policy in the last few months. I want to ask the Senator from Virginia whether the United States Government in delivering mail on the Shenandoah Valley road pays tolls?

Mr. SWANSON. I should think that was formerly so, because that road was built by a turnpike company, which was a corporation in which the State of Virginia was a large stockholder. I think now the State of Virginia has taken that road over and made it a State road. I am satisfied that no tolls are now being collected; but originally that road was constructed by a corporation, in which, as I have said, the State of Virginia was a large stockholder.

Mr. McCUMBER. And after the State of Virginia gets a nice little sum to build her roads she will at least stop charging the Nation for going over them.

Mr. SWANSON. I think every tollgate has been taken off since the State of Virginia took that road over. The State of Virginia did not get any dividends from the money previously collected on the road, but, as I understand, it was all spent on its improvement.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am not saying anything in criticism of it, but I simply want to know whether the Government of the United States has been paying tolls, as private individuals have been doing.

Mr. SWANSON. I should think it has been, although I do not know. It was a corporation which built this road—the Valley Turnpike Co. Some private individuals had stock in the company, and the State of Virginia was a stockholder. Now, I think the State of Virginia has taken over this, that it is a State road, and that there are no tollgates on it.

Mr. McCUMBER. Then we, who pay about four-fifths of the taxes for the purposes of these roads, will be entitled, I presume, to drive over them as freely as we now drive over other roads.

Mr. SWANSON. The Senator from North Dakota says, "We who pay about four-fifths of the taxes." These roads are to be constructed by Federal aid.

Mr. McCUMBER. No; I say we who have paid four-fifths of the taxes for the construction of the roads now to be built under this appropriation.

Mr. SWANSON. There is no payment of four-fifths under this bill by anybody. The Federal Government simply pays one-half upon the roads upon which it carries its own mails.

Mr. McCUMBER. I understand that.

Mr. SWANSON. How the Senator can say anyone pays four-fifths, I can not understand.

Mr. McCUMBER. I say that of the sum which will pay this one-half four-fifths will come from the Northern States. That is what I mean.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. SWANSON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BANKHEAD. In answer to the question of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER], I desire to say that if he will read the bill he will see that it expressly provides that no part of this appropriation shall go to roads where tolls are charged. That language is in the original law; it has always been in the law; and the road to which he refers has never received a cent of this money, and never can if it charges tolls.

Mr. McCUMBER. Anything that will knock down the poles across my drive in going through Virginia I shall look upon with great favor.

Mr. SWANSON. They have disappeared, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. SWANSON. I do.

Mr. KELLOGG. If the Senator is willing to eliminate what I understood to be the latter part of the amendment as to three years, I think, as the Senator from Wisconsin says, the law now takes care of two years, and so does not need any amendment at all.

Mr. SWANSON. The law says "succeeding year," and my amendment says "the second year."

Mr. KELLOGG. The "succeeding year" is the second year.

Mr. SWANSON. I will explain it to the Senator. If the appropriation is confined to this year or is made to expire in the first part of the next year the legislature would have to meet in the meantime in order to secure the benefit of this legislation. Some legislatures do not meet except once in two years, and they would be compelled to hold an extra session in some States in order to get the funds to comply with this law.

Mr. KELLOGG. I think the Senator from Virginia is entirely mistaken, because this law applies to this appropriation, and this appropriation is not going to be made in the last fiscal year, but in this fiscal year. Then any sum not appropriated will go over to the next year, just as the Senator from Wisconsin has stated. I think the law now takes care of it. If the Senator will look it over I am sure he will see that it does.

Mr. SWANSON. My attention was called to the matter by the highway commissioner of Virginia, who stated that our legislature would not meet this year. It was at his suggestion that I offered the amendment. Other States are similarly situated.

Mr. KELLOGG. Do I understand that the Senator has eliminated the last part of his amendment?

Mr. SWANSON. The last part of the amendment may be eliminated, because every State has a highway commission now.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I trust that this amendment will not be adopted by the Senate. The existing law would authorize as to the \$50,000,000 provided for, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the legislature of any State to provide for the same amount for building these roads any time until June 30, 1920. With the amendment it means that the appropriation of \$50,000,000, which is asked for at this time, based upon the fact that it is to be used primarily for giving employment to the unemployed of this country; that the legislature of a State, if this amendment is adopted, need not even draw the money from

the Government until June 30, 1922, the second appropriation of \$75,000,000 until 1923, and the third appropriation not until June 30, 1924.

Then, under this amendment—although I understand now that the Senator from Virginia is perfectly willing to eliminate it—if a State does not have a highway commission there can be one year more added to the years to which I have already called attention.

I think, if there is any justification for making these appropriations, they ought to be made for this year, if possible; that the expenditure of the money ought to begin as quickly as possible, and let a future Congress take care of the \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921. The next Congress or the Congress two years hence will know very much more, Mr. President, about the condition of the Treasury of the United States and the ability of the people of this country to pay taxes than we do at this time. We should not at this time be obligating the Government of the United States to pay hundreds of millions of dollars when we scarcely know how we are going to meet the expenses of the Government for the coming fiscal year.

Reference has been made to-day to the amount of taxes which will have to be raised for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, or the coming fiscal year. Why, Mr. President, if we should take every dollar of profit of all the businesses in the United States it would not be sufficient to pay the obligations which the Government will be under for the next fiscal year. Ten billion dollars will not cover those obligations.

I say now that if it is undertaken to collect more than \$4,000,000,000 out of the business of the country for 1919 by way of taxation the business interests of the country can not stand it; there will be failures from one end of this land to the other, and the panics which we have had in this country in the past will have been as zephyrs compared to a cyclone. So I want the American people to know now that they have got to purchase bonds next year—not this year alone but next year as well—not millions or hundreds of millions of dollars' worth but billions of dollars' worth. If Congress is going to appropriate money for the building of roads now, I think it ought to make one appropriation, and that it ought to require the money to be expended, if the States take advantage of this law, at the very earliest possible date.

I intend to offer an amendment, if no other Senator does, as soon as the pending amendment is disposed of, to strike out \$75,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921. That means, Mr. President, under the pending amendment, if adopted, the States need not provide money or expend money upon these roads until the year 1924.

The Senator from Virginia says that we have been perfectly willing to pay the railroads for carrying mail over their roads, but that we were not willing to pay for carrying the mail over the country roads. Why, Mr. President, there is not a letter or a package being carried over the country roads wherever mail is carried that is not paid for by the Government. We have the rural route delivery; we have men employed by the tens of thousands for that purpose. I will admit that in the past they have not always been paid what they ought to have been paid for that service, and I am glad to see that there is some provision made here to take care of those men who labor in season and out of season, in all sorts of weather, and under all sorts of conditions, and that they are being recognized in this bill. However, the mail carried over the country roads costs the Government of the United States more, of course, in proportion than does the carriage of mail over the railroad lines, and it ought to do so. Nobody is objecting to that; but I do not want to hear arguments used in this Chamber that nothing is paid for that service.

Mr. President, all I shall ask is that the Senate record its judgment on this amendment. I think the present law which gives one year's time for the State to decide whether they desire to build a road or not, or to decide upon what roads the money shall be spent, affords a long enough time during which the Treasury of the United States should be bound. I hope that the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROTH] has expressed my views in reference to these appropriations. I can justify such appropriations for the first year and possibly for two years, but I do not believe that the general terms of the existing law should be changed. This ought to be treated and considered as an emergency appropriation to care for the emergency that everybody fears is impending. So, Mr. President, I make the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it changes existing law. That seems to be conceded by everyone.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia care to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SWANSON. I will leave it to the Chair to decide whether the point of order is well taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The point of order is sustained.

SENATOR FROM MICHIGAN.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I rise to move the present consideration of Senate resolution 415.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Baird	Henderson	Martin, Va.	Sherman
Bankhead	Hollis	Moses	Simmons
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	Myers	Smith, S. C.
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Smoot
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Nugent	Sutherland
Cummins	Kellogg	Page	Swanson
Curtis	Kendrick	Pittman	Thomas
Dillingham	Kenyon	Poin Dexter	Thompson
Fernald	Kirby	Pollock	Townsend
Fletcher	Knox	Pomerene	Underwood
France	La Follette	Reed	Vardaman
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Robinson	Wadsworth
Gay	McCumber	Saulsbury	Warren
Gerry	McKellar	Shafroth	Watson
Hale	McNary	Sheppard	Weeks

Mr. SHEPPARD. I desire to announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECKHAM], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] are detained on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate resolution 415, which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 415), as follows:

Whereas a petition has been filed with the Senate of the United States by Mr. Henry Ford, of Michigan, contesting the election of Mr. Truman H. Newberry, of Michigan, as a Senator from said State, and asking for the preservation and recount of the ballots, and the investigation of the unlawful expenditures of money alleged to have been made by and on behalf of the said Mr. Truman H. Newberry, and notice thereof has been given; and

Whereas information has been received to the effect that in certain localities within the State some of the ballots are being destroyed, and that others are likely to be destroyed unless they are taken possession of by the Senate for the purpose of preserving and recounting the same: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the said petition and the papers and the documents accompanying the same be, and they are hereby, referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for investigation and report thereon.

Resolved further, That the said Committee on Privileges and Elections of the Senate, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and it is hereby, authorized and empowered to take possession of the ballots, poll books, tally sheets, and all other documents and records relating to the said election held for United States Senator in the State of Michigan on the 5th day of November, 1918, and that the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate be, and he is hereby, instructed to carry out the directions of the said Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, in that behalf, and that the said Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and it is hereby, directed to proceed with all convenient speed to take all necessary steps for the preservation of the said ballots, poll books, tally sheets, and other documents, and to recount the said ballots, and to take and preserve all evidence as to the various matters alleged in the said petition and notice, and of any alleged fraud, irregularity, and unlawful expenditure of money in the said election and primaries, and to the intimidation of voters, or other facts affecting the result of said election.

Resolved further, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, be authorized to sit during the sessions of the Senate and during any recess of the Senate or of the Congress, to hold its sessions at such place or places as it shall deem most convenient for the purposes of the investigation, and to have full power to subpoena parties and witnesses, and to require the production of all papers, books, and documents, and other evidence relating to the said investigation; and to employ clerks and stenographers at a cost not to exceed \$1 per printed page, to take and make a record of all evidence taken and received by the committee; and to keep a record of its proceedings; and to have such evidence, records, and other matter required by the committee printed.

Resolved further, That the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate and his deputy are hereby required to attend the said Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any subcommittee thereof, and to execute its directions; that the chairman or any member of the committee be, and is hereby, empowered to administer oaths; that each of the parties to said contest be entitled to representatives and attorneys at the recount and the taking of evidence; that all disputed ballots or records be preserved, so that final action may be had thereon by the full committee and the Senate; that the committee may appoint subcommittees of one or more members to represent the committee at the various places in the making of the recount and the taking of evidence, and the committee may appoint such supervisors of the recount as it may deem best; and that the committee may adopt and enforce such rules and regulations for the conduct of the recount and the taking of evidence as it may deem wise, not inconsistent with this resolution; and that the committee shall report to the Senate as early as may be; and from time to time, if it deems best, submit all the testimony and the result of the recount.

Resolved further, That the expenses incurred in the carrying out of these resolutions shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers ordered by the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, and approved by the chairman of the committee.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I would not rise to present this motion if I were not impressed with the fact that it is necessary under the conditions as they exist in the Michigan contest. It is not the idea of the committee that this Senate should finally decide upon the merits of this case. We understand, of course, that even if we attempted to do that it would not be binding on the succeeding Senate. I agree that unless there are extraordinary circumstances, which I do not have in mind now, the commission which is issued by the governor of the State is prima facie evidence of title, which would give the contestee the right to the seat temporarily or until the case shall be finally decided, but the issue goes beyond that.

This election was held on the 5th of November. The primaries were held in August or September. It appears of record in the State of Michigan that in this particular primary there was collected by a committee which had in charge the Newberry campaign \$178,000, and that it expended \$176,000 in that campaign. It is charged that the expenditures were perhaps two or three times this amount. I do not know what the fact is in that behalf. Suffice it to say that that amount, of which we have record, is an extraordinary amount, a sum largely in excess of any amount that has ever been expended in any State, so far as we have any record.

A notice of contest has been filed. It appeared before the committee that after this expenditure of money became known to the public, and particularly to the people of the State of Michigan, efforts were made to get Mr. Newberry to withdraw, but, it seems, without avail.

After this petition came into the Senate on January 27, 1919, this resolution asking for an investigation was favorably reported to the Senate. About the time that report was made, or a little later, a communication was sent to the United States Senate signed by the attorney of Mr. Newberry, Judge Murfin, who, I understand, is a very reputable lawyer, in which he makes certain countercharges against Mr. Ford, the contestant. I do not know what the purpose of the presentation of this communication was, but its effect upon my mind was to confirm me in the conviction that it was very necessary to inquire into all of the facts connected with the senatorial election. A full opportunity should be given both to the contestant and the contestee at the earliest moment possible to show the facts, whatever they may be; and I have faith that, after the facts are shown, the Senate will decide the contest in accordance with the law and the facts. It ought not to be otherwise, and I do not believe it will be otherwise.

Now, perhaps, Senators will inquire as to the necessity for beginning these hearings now; and I wish to address myself to that branch of the subject for a few moments. Bear in mind that the charges here are fraud, excessive expenditures in violation of the law, State and national. If anyone has been guilty of any charges of this kind, there are those, if we are to judge by what we know to be the usual experience in such cases, who are willing to get rid of the testimony.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. POMERENE. For a question.

Mr. KNOX. I only wish to inquire of the Senator from Ohio if there is any allegation on the record that any testimony is likely to be lost except the testimony of the ballots?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes, Mr. President; and I will address myself to that in a few minutes; but I want to lead up to it in the regular order.

There are about 2,200 precincts in Michigan. There is a statute which provides for a recount, generally speaking; but on five or six different occasions the Supreme Court of Michigan has held that in the case of contests, as for a seat in Congress, the State authorities do not have the power to order a recount, because they took the position—and I think erroneously—that inasmuch as the Constitution made the Senate or the House, as the case may be, the judge of the qualifications and elections of a Senator or a Representative, therefore the State authorities could not intervene; and the court has taken that position, even assuming that the commission had been issued where there was palpable fraud or a palpable mistake; so that the only thing that could be done in order to bring about a recount was to present the subject to the United States Senate.

Before it came here a proceeding was begun by the contestant in the United States courts in Michigan asking for a temporary injunction or restraining order for the preservation

of the ballots. A temporary restraining order was issued. Later on the contestant and contestee appeared before the committee and an arrangement was made looking to the preservation of the ballots. Let me say that before the notice of injunction was served upon the defendants in at least two cases the ballots at Marquette and at Saginaw Bay were destroyed, and one of the clerks—I think the clerk in the city of Saginaw—who had charge of these ballots made a statement to the effect that he had disposed of the ballots in that city for junk.

Mr. President, after some conferences here a stipulation was entered into by the counsel representing the contestant and the contestee. Later on an injunction was entered continuing the temporary restraining order. The committee was advised by Judge Murfin, representing Mr. Newberry, on January 21, as follows:

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.,
January 21, 1919.

HON. ATLEE POMERENE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Pursuant to stipulation between Messrs. Ford and Newberry made in Washington Saturday, final court orders have been entered in both eastern and western districts in Michigan in the Federal court whereby ballots and boxes are now indefinitely preserved. This means they will be available 1 month, 1 year, or 10 years hence if a showing should ever be made making the Senate feel they wish to examine these ballots.

J. O. MURFIN,

Attorney of Record for Thurman E. Newberry.

Now, I shall not charge that Judge Murfin intentionally misrepresented the scope of this investigation; but I have before me a copy of the journal entry, and a copy of the stipulation was read into this journal entry. That reads:

The parties, by their counsel, will, and they do hereby, stipulate in the two cases between the parties pending in the eastern and northern districts of Michigan, respectively, that orders may be entered, and shall forthwith be entered, if the courts approve, that the injunctions shall be continued in full force as heretofore granted until such time as the Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate may and shall take possession of the ballots and all the contents, records, and the like in the ballot boxes, including poll books, tally sheets, etc.

That the procedure of the taking possession by the Sergeant at Arms shall be fixed by the United States Senate, and the representatives of each party shall be present when the transfer of the ballots and papers shall be made from the boxes to the custody of the Sergeant at Arms.

It is understood that action shall be taken to transfer the ballots, etc., from the boxes in time so that the boxes may be used at the approaching April elections.

It is understood that this stipulation does not foreclose or prejudice either party as to the matters contended for by them respectively.

Signed by the parties, by their respective attorneys.

And the court being advised, it is hereby ordered that the restraining order heretofore entered and issued out of this court on the 28th day of December, 1918, be, and the same is hereby, continued in full force as heretofore granted until such time as the Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate may and shall take possession of the ballots and all the contents, records, and the like, in the ballot boxes, including poll books, tally sheets, etc., relating to the November 5, 1918, election for United States Senator for the State of Michigan, and until the further order of this court.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. As I understand the rule, the Senator moving to take up a matter of this kind is not permitted to discuss the merits of the measure. I am not objecting to that, however; but my inquiry is, Will other Senators be debarred from discussing it in answer to what the Senator is saying?

Mr. POMERENE. Why, Mr. President, if that question is addressed to me, I surely will have no objection. I have understood that under the rules of the Senate a motion of this character, made after 2 o'clock, was debatable.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The motion to take it up is debatable; but the debate on the question itself, I have understood, has always been decided the other way. As I say, however, I am not making objection to it, except that if the Chair should rule as I have indicated, in case a point of order is made when an answer is attempted, I should feel obliged to invoke the rule now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator raise the point of order? [A pause.] The Chair will say to the Senator that the motion is debatable, but the main question is not, under the rules of the Senate, as the Chair understands them.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is my understanding—that the motion is a debatable one, but not the merits of the matter.

Mr. POMERENE. I have been in the Senate for eight years, and I have never heard of any restrictions being placed upon debate. I wish the rules might be so changed that there would be restrictions placed upon it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have no doubt that that is the rule. As I said, I have no objection to it myself; but I do not want to be debarred from replying, if a point of order is raised by anybody else, as I fear it will be. Then we would have an ex parte statement, and that I do object to.

Mr. POMERENE. I want to say to the Senator from Michigan that I hope no one will raise that point of order, if there is anything in the point of order.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have no doubt at all of the good faith of the Senator from Ohio. I have no doubt about it; but if the Chair should rule, when a point of order was made, that it was not debatable and an answer could not be made, I can readily see where an unfair proposition would be presented to the Senate.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I shall be among the first to protest against anything unfair being done in this matter.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think I will rely upon the good faith of the Senator, and not make a point of order.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, there is not any question on earth about the fact that when the Senator from Ohio takes his seat any Senator in this Chamber can be recognized, and he can speak in answer to the Senator from Ohio, or he can speak on any other question that he sees fit, provided he keeps within the rules.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is not my understanding of the rule. My understanding of the rule is that in a case of this kind, on a motion to take up a bill or resolution, it has to be debated on the question as to whether it will be taken up to supplant another measure.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has stated the rule; but he will apply the rule in exactly the same way to both sides, as far as the present occupant of the chair is concerned.

Mr. POMERENE. The last paragraph of this journal entry reads:

It is further ordered that the foregoing order shall not prevent the use of the aforesaid ballot boxes by any of the other defendants when necessary for lawful election purposes, and that this court reserves authority to permit the use of said boxes for lawful election purposes.

I read this to point out that notwithstanding the assurance which Judge Murfin gave to the committee and which I have no doubt, knowing his reputation as I hear it to be, was made in perfectly good faith at the same time, the order does not give the protection to these ballots which he suggested in the telegram.

Let me add further, in this connection, that while the statutes of Michigan provide that after the election the ballots shall be returned to the ballot box and sealed up and preserved, there is no stated time for this preservation, and the practice has been to keep them only until the next general election, and then they are destroyed; and the next general election will be sometime in the first week in April, as I am informed.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield for a question.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does the Senator know that this week a bill passed the Michigan Legislature, and has become a law, providing for the preservation of these ballots at the petition of either of the parties or of anybody desiring a recount?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I did not know that the bill had passed. A form of a bill was presented to the committee, and it was said that it would be presented to the general assembly.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That bill has become a law.

Mr. POMERENE. I was not aware of that fact. Now, Mr. President, it may be that that law will provide for some further protection to these ballots. I hope it does.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMPSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. POMERENE. I do.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator permit me at this time to ask the Senator from Michigan whether he has with him a copy of that bill as passed?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have.

Mr. REED. In the Chamber?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes, sir.

Mr. REED. I presume the Senator will present it, then, at the proper time?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I shall. I am going to have it read to the Senate.

Mr. POMERENE. Now, Mr. President, what I have said refers to only one of the questions involved in this contest.

The statement was made before the committee that shortly after publicity was given to these expenditures and the possible results, the correspondence belonging to the committee having in charge the Newberry campaign was taken out and burned. I think, in the present state of the record, I am justified in making the statement that there were large bank accounts, and that the checks which were drawn upon these accounts are also likely to be destroyed, if they are in existence now. More than that, it appears that some time, perhaps in November or December, possibly earlier than that, an inquiry into the question of these ex-

penditures was begun by the United States grand jury in the city of New York.

The corrupt-practices act provides that an itemized statement of the receipts and expenditures of the primary, as well as the general election, shall be filed with the Secretary of the United States Senate; but this act provides further that the deposit of this affidavit in the United States mail shall be construed as a compliance with the provision of the act requiring it to be filed with the Secretary of the Senate. The affidavit in this case was made and mailed by Mr. Newberry in New York, where he has a temporary residence, and it later reached the United States Senate.

These facts, it is believed, gave to the Federal court in New York City jurisdiction. Witnesses were subpoenaed to appear before the grand jury. I am basing my statement in part upon the briefs filed in the United States Supreme Court. Men who had charge of this campaign appeared before the grand jury and refused to testify, and presented as a reason for their refusal a written opinion which was furnished them by a lawyer to the effect that the Federal corrupt-practices act was unconstitutional.

I have had some experience in trial work, and never until this case did I ever hear that it was the privilege of a witness in a grand inquest, conducted by a grand jury, to plead the unconstitutionality of a statute. I understand, of course, that a witness is always privileged to refuse to answer a question where the answer might tend to incriminate him or subject him to disgrace. The witnesses in that case, after refusing to testify, were adjudged guilty of contempt, and the case is now pending in the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, the charges in the petition or memorial filed on the part of the contestant charge fraud and violations of the law. The charges filed in the memorial which is presented to the United States Senate on behalf of Mr. Newberry charge likewise extravagant expenditure of money and violations of law.

Under the circumstances, ought the United States Senate sitting now go forward and try to secure the evidence, such as it may be, or ought we to wait until the sitting of another Congress? That is the point; and in my judgment the Senate of the United States will be derelict in its duty if it does not take all the necessary precautions in order to preserve this testimony both for and against Mr. Newberry and for and against Mr. Ford.

It is to be assumed, of course, that the witnesses who will be called will be sworn, that they will be examined by the attorneys of either party, and perhaps by the members of the committee who may be sitting to hear the evidence. If any false testimony is procured on behalf of either party, then between this and the next session there will be plenty of opportunity to investigate it. If the testimony is true, then Senators as well as contestant and contestee ought to welcome it.

I am not concerned as to the outcome of this contest. I am concerned that the members of the committee and of the Senate shall do their duty as I think I see it, and see it clearly, so that it may not be said that an injustice has been done to either one party or the other because of the law's delay.

Mr. President, I want to take the time of the Senate for just a few minutes longer.

These charges do not come here alone from persons who are immediately interested, but the charges of corruption were made in the State of Michigan before the primary was held. A communication was sent to the Senate by Mr. Elbert H. Fowler, who, I understand, had charge of the Ford campaign, and in connection with it is a letter by the lieutenant governor of Michigan, Hon. L. D. Dickinson, dated August 22, 1918, in which he discusses conditions as they were during the preprimary campaign. I read a part of this letter:

Men of all walks of life, who have the best interests of our State at heart, believe the men who are conducting your campaign for United States Senator are conducting one that will bring one of the greatest scandals on our State that Michigan politics ever saw, and have asked me to take the lead in attempting to rid our State of this blight.

I note by your statement that you say you do not know of these things.

This letter was written prior to the primary.

In giving you the information I will give you the terms that I hear everywhere in the 62 counties in which I have been recently. I have always had the highest regard for you, and must believe you will relieve the Republican Party and the State of a campaign that is now being likened to the notorious Lorimer campaign of Illinois a few years ago. The terms "boodle" and "rotten" seem to be general terms that I hear.

Another paragraph:

Every section of the State shows evidence of an expensive newspaper campaign, costing thousands and thousands of dollars. Thousands of men are liberally paid for work at many more thousands of dollars, an expensive suite of offices with a large force sending out hundreds of thousands of letters to influential voters at more thousands of dollars, thousands of autos already engaged for use on primary day at many more

thousands, that practically every opponent of the primary system is backing your campaign, and that hundreds of the experts who have figured in or conducted for money the wet campaigns of the past are among the most active of your supporters.

Conservative estimates say everywhere from \$250,000 to \$500,000 is being used. The good people of the State are apparently powerless to give the voters these matters on short notice. In case you get the most votes, you must expect to have the placing of your name on the election ballot contested. If by technical reasons you succeed, then you must expect every church and moral organization to work until election night to keep our fair State from the baneful influence that success following such methods would leave for years to come.

It was said by one of the attorneys representing Mr. Newberry before the committee that notwithstanding that letter the Republican lieutenant governor supported Mr. Newberry.

Mr. Dickinson was reelected lieutenant governor at the same election by from 115,000 to 118,000 majority. Mr. Newberry's plurality was, on the face of the returns, 7,500. The conditions of Michigan were such that when Mr. Dickinson was inaugurated lieutenant governor of his State in an address to the State senate he said, among other things:

Primary elections will call for action on your part. * * * More communications on this line asking for legislative action have come to me by far than all others combined, and almost without exception Republican, not only from all parts of Michigan, but from other States. This, you know, is the outgrowth of a candidacy that doubtless cost more money than ever before was paid for a nomination for office in all the world's history. * * * The individual or even party interests are of little note when the sanctity of the ballot and safety of democracy are at stake. From almost every part of the State come to me pleas that this legislature make it impossible in the future to witness the sale of a public office on the auction block, but rather that the laborer, the farmer, the business or professional voter, however humble but able and respectable, may have a chance with the man of millions.

If this statement came from an adversary, if it came from one of the opposite political faith, it might well be questioned, but when it comes from the lieutenant governor of a sovereign State, who was reelected by an overwhelming vote at the same election at which Mr. Newberry presented himself as a candidate for the United States Senate, it speaks volumes.

If this is the way in which this subject appeals to the official class of Michigan, and, I add, to the good citizenship of that great and good State, ought we to delay? When the lieutenant governor is appealing to the legislature of his State for additional legislation in order to prevent a recurrence of this situation, will the United States Senate sit silently by while this testimony may, in part, at least, be where we can not get at it if it is needed, if some future Congress insists that there ought to be an investigation and we do not?

If the situation is one-half as bad as described in the lieutenant governor's letter and his address to the Michigan Senate, does not the Senate of the United States owe it to itself to inquire what the facts are?

Statements are filed with this committee giving the names of reputable witnesses who, it is said, will be able to show that Mr. Newberry was in constant touch with his campaign committee. I shall await with interest the testimony on that subject. I do not care, and I shall not prejudice. Mr. Newberry makes the statement, as appears in the record in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, to the effect that he spent nothing in this campaign, that he received no contributions, and I think I quote him correctly when I say that his language was, in substance, that nothing was either received or expended to his knowledge. He does make a statement in one of the affidavits which was filed to the effect that he had heard some reports about the activities of some of his friends, but that they were purely voluntary. The letter which Mr. Dickinson, the lieutenant governor, first wrote to him was written to and received by Mr. Newberry a number of days before the primary was held, advising him as to the conditions that prevailed.

Let us look at the other side of the proposition. It is stated by Judge Murfin, on behalf of Mr. Newberry, in substance, that Mr. Ford and his friends conducted a campaign of very great extravagance and that they had violated the law. My answer to this charge is, if both have violated the law, then neither of them ought to sit here in the Senate.

And now, Mr. President, I wish to repeat very briefly that those Senators who favored this investigation and favor it now, lest the evidence be dissipated, do not ask and will not ask that this Senate shall attempt to pass judgment upon the title of either party to a seat in this Chamber. We are simply taking such steps as we believe are required of the Senate sitting now. Now should be the accepted time to take the testimony. It is not an unheard-of thing to begin proceedings for the preservation of testimony. The code of civil procedure and the common law itself provide for methods to do this, and we are simply following the precedents in that behalf when we ask that the Senate authorize the committee to take up this subject and order the investigation now.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. KNOX. I should like to make an inquiry, and I should like to have an answer if the Senator from Ohio is willing to make one. Suppose this investigation is pending and testimony is being taken at the time of the organization of the next Senate, what effect, in the judgment of the Senator from Ohio, would that fact have upon Mr. Newberry taking his seat under his credentials from the State of Michigan?

Mr. POMERENE. In my judgment, none whatever, unless some facts might develop, which I do not anticipate.

Mr. KNOX. I should like to know, if the Senator is willing to answer, what he means by facts developing. Facts of what nature developing, in respect to what particular phase of the matter?

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I had nothing special in mind. I think, without an exception, so far as I now know, when a Senator presents his credentials in legal form at the time he seeks to be qualified, the Senate would have to seat him. The question can be taken up afterwards and determined as to whether he shall be unseated.

Mr. KNOX. In other words, as I understand the Senator from Ohio, the merits of the contest would have no bearing upon the right of the Senator to take his seat under his certificate?

Mr. POMERENE. I should think not.

Mr. President, I dislike very much to interfere with the consideration of the bill that is before the Senate, but I have felt an effort was being made to prevent the passage of this resolution at this session and to block the taking of any of this testimony, and I feel it a duty that I owe to myself, to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, as well as to the Senate to place briefly before the Senate the issue as I understand it, and then the Senate must take the responsibility.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I regret exceedingly that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] feels it is wise and best at this time to take up this Michigan senatorial controversy. He has admitted, to begin with, that this Senate has nothing to do with the qualifications and election of Mr. Newberry; that the next Senate has the power of deciding these questions, and, further, that any action which might be taken by the committee at this time might be absolutely ignored by the next Senate, and all the expense and time and trouble will have been wasted.

I wish to say at the outset that I am no more in sympathy with the illegal or extravagant expenditure of money than is the Senator from Ohio, and at the proper time, before the proper tribunal, if there shall be a basis of fact for investigation, I shall not oppose it.

I believe the proposed procedure in this case is wholly unwarranted and absolutely unnecessary. For the contestant, Mr. Ford, I have no ill feeling; I understand he has always been my friend, and I have no personal animosity against him. As a citizen and business man he has my great respect, but it is well for the Senate to understand the history of Mr. Ford's candidacy for the Senate and the circumstances which actuated and promoted it.

Some time in June of last year some practical Democratic politicians of Michigan, of whom the attorney for Mr. Ford in these proceedings was the principal advisor, as he is his advisor now, recognizing the fact that Michigan is normally strongly Republican, set out to defeat the party by indirection through the primaries. Mr. Ford was sent for by the President and went to the White House. He tells the result of the interview practically in this language:

I do not feel qualified to act as Senator, have no disposition to be a Senator; but the President asked me to be a candidate in Michigan and I accepted that request as a command, and I am going to be a candidate.

When asked what party he was to represent, he said he had no particular choice; he was not a partisan man, but he consented to be a candidate on both tickets, the Republican and the Democratic. The fact that Michigan is strongly Republican makes it easy for our Democratic friends to go into the Republican primaries and nominate the man whom they would like to defeat. They have done it in the past. This time they endeavored to select the Republican nominee, not to defeat him but to defeat the Republican choice.

The Democrats joined in the Republican primaries for the purpose of trying to put upon that party Mr. Ford as their candidate as well as ours, because, while under the Michigan law a man can not run on two tickets for election, but must make his choice as to which one he will accept, it was arranged that he should refuse to accept the nomination on the Democratic ticket and abide by the privilege that was granted him to run as a Republican.

In the primaries he was defeated for the nomination on the Republican ticket but was nominated on the Democratic ticket. It is the campaign for the primary about which complaint is made, for I venture the assertion that if it were not for the primary there would not even be an allegation that there was any fraud in the election. It was the primary in Michigan that created the greatest disturbance.

In spite of the charges of rival candidates, Mr. Newberry was nominated by a substantial majority in the primaries and went on the Republican ticket as its candidate. The election was held, and something over a month after it occurred, and after the time had expired for filing a notice of a demand for a recount under our statute, Mr. Ford announced through his attorneys that he was satisfied with the election and should make no contest. Under our laws there is no provision for the preservation of ballots after the official count, the returns of the State board of election canvassers, and the certificate of election has been issued. Mr. Ford made no complaint at that time and for nearly a month thereafter.

The Senator from Ohio has referred to the fact that there is danger of the destruction of the ballots and that ballots had been destroyed. Mr. Ford in his petition to the Senator's committee set out that ballots had been destroyed, some of them at that time; but no notice had been given that a contest was even expected. These ballots were destroyed in accordance with the ordinary custom. They were destroyed in Marquette because there was an election in December following the November election, and they had to be destroyed in order to use the boxes. No one thought that they would ever be called for and there was not the slightest suggestion that these ballots were to be treated differently from the way ballots theretofore had been treated. I understand that is practically the situation in Saginaw and Port Huron. But it can not be shown, as I am informed, that there were any ballots destroyed after Mr. Ford had given notice or even suggested that he wanted a recount. The ballots have been preserved.

Now, mark you, sir, it was Mr. Ford who invoked the Federal courts of Michigan for preservation of those ballots. He secured a temporary restraining order in the two Federal courts of our State. Before the time for a hearing on those orders had arrived the representatives of Mr. Ford and Mr. Newberry appeared before the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and the legal representative of Mr. Ford expressed some doubt as to the validity or the power of the court which he had invoked. Therefore the two parties stipulated that the temporary restraining orders should be made permanent. Mr. Newberry's attorney went home, according to instructions, and appeared before the two courts and had those restraining orders made permanent, and they are so to-day, and the ballots are in the possession of the courts.

Notwithstanding that fact and realizing that possibly there would be a conflict between State and Federal authorities, I want to say here, by way of parenthesis, that I do not believe those Federal courts or this Senate can legally take possession of those ballots against the law of the State of Michigan, although there has been no action and no disposition manifested to interfere in the least with the preservation of the ballots, because Mr. Newberry, if there is to be a recount, is, I believe, more interested in the preservation of them than is Mr. Ford, as I shall attempt to show if this resolution is to be considered; but, notwithstanding this fact, Mr. Newberry's friends caused a remedial law to be enacted in Michigan to provide for the preservation of ballots, if invoked.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. FLETCHER. I merely wish to inquire of the Senator, as he made reference to restraining orders issued by the court ordering those ballots to be preserved and retained, whether there was any modification of any of those orders to the effect that they would be held in reserve until the next election, or words to that effect?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Not at all. I have the orders here. I shall put them into the Record a little later so the Senator may see just what they were. They were in compliance with Mr. Ford's attorney's request to preserve the ballots.

Mr. FLETCHER. I understood there was some modification of one of those orders to the effect that they would be retained until the time came to use the ballot boxes again in which those ballots were placed.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will put the restraining orders in the Record in just a moment when I come to them so the Senator can see just exactly what the orders were. They provide for preserving the ballots indefinitely.

I am making these preliminary remarks because this is a question which is going to require a great deal of time, if the

Senate sees fit to lay aside its legitimate business to take up the work of the next Senate. This proposed action admittedly will not be binding upon the next Senate. If Senators wish to do this they can, but the facts must be disclosed, although I shall be willing to yield at any time for the purpose of taking up the legitimate business of this Congress.

But to get back to the procedure, it was doubted by some, as I have said, that this power of the Federal court would be effective in restraining the destruction of the ballots; that they belong to the State and that the State would possibly ignore some order that might be issued which they regarded as unconstitutional, and therefore a bill was introduced in the Senate and House of representatives at Lansing as soon as it was possible to prepare one, and at the earliest possible moment, not losing a single day, both Houses passed the bill unanimously. Mr. Ford's attorney knew that this action was to be taken, and as I understand it he approved it. I have received a telegram from our governor, dated February 4, as follows—

House enrolled act No. 1, being an act to provide for the preservation of ballots cast for office of United States Senator in cases of contested elections or in cases where notices of contested election may be given, etc., has this day received my approval and is now a law in full force and effect in the State of Michigan.

ALBERT E. SLEEPER.

I shall put that bill into the RECORD. It provides that Mr. Ford may go into the Supreme Court, and to cover any possible question of jurisdiction it is provided that in the circuit court of the county of Ingham he may petition to have these ballots preserved, and provides the way in which it can be done, and everything has been done to preserve the ballots, and that was the only thing of any serious consequence that was presented to the committee showing that there was danger that something might happen to embarrass the investigation of this case by the next Senate.

But this is not the whole story of this proceeding. After Mr. Ford had been placed in the race in Michigan by the President of the United States, after the people of our State had decided in the primary that he was not the Republican nominee, and this after the Ford committee had published every one of these things which the Senator has brought out here, spread them before the people in the campaign for election, the people decided by a majority vote that Mr. Newberry was Michigan's choice for Senator. The Ford party or the Ford committee simply covered our State with advertisements, many pages of advertisements in the newspapers, calling attention to the fact that Mr. Newberry had expended \$176,000 in the primary campaign and then, in connection therewith, statements showing that Mr. Ford spent \$3,000,000 to build a hospital, and further stating that Mr. Ford, who had millions of dollars' worth of contracts with the Government, proposed to give his share of the war profits back to the Government. Those things were all published to the people. The people passed upon them.

Mr. Ford reached the voters several times during that campaign. His committee reports—and I shall have something to say about that later—or the Democratic State central committee reports, that it spent about \$53,000. His own committee expended something like \$1,500 or \$1,800. Yet, Mr. President, when this question comes up I shall show one pamphlet that was sent out by the Ford people that must have cost at least \$80,000 to print, mail, and distribute—one pamphlet alone. It is what was known as the pamphlet de luxe.

It is well that Senators should know all about this case and what influences may be inspiring it. Mr. Ford gave an interview for publication the other day in Los Angeles, Cal., stating that he spent no money for the nomination or election, but he would spend a million dollars, if necessary, to keep Mr. Newberry out of the Senate.

I can understand somewhat of this propaganda that is being urged, and I do not charge with indirection or bad faith the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, for whom I have the greatest respect; but he does not know it all. The thing has been misrepresented to him. He has asked that we lend the influence of this body, which has nothing to do with Mr. Newberry's primary or election, for the purpose of molding a public sentiment before trial in the next Senate, which may influence its action in regard to the seating of Mr. Newberry.

The Senator admits for the first time that Mr. Newberry's credentials, being proper and regular, he will be entitled to be sworn in on the day of the next session when he shall present himself to the Senate.

Then, I say, if the Senator, who will probably be on the Committee on Privileges and Elections, or any other Senator, feels, after looking over all the facts that have been presented, that an investigation for fraud or for any other purpose that would invalidate Mr. Newberry's seat should be made, he will not find me opposing him in his position; but, Mr. President, not only is

there a determined and powerful influence at work to prevent the seating of Mr. Newberry, but I believe that there is the widest misrepresentation of facts connected with the election or the primary of which it is possible to conceive.

There is another incident, Mr. President, that ought to be borne in mind: The Senator from Ohio has referred to the grand jury proceedings in New York. After the primaries and in the very midst of the campaign for election, in October grand jury proceedings were instituted in New York City, a thousand miles, more or less, from Michigan.

That proceeding was instituted for the purpose of showing that the friends of Mr. Newberry and Mr. Newberry himself had violated the corrupt-practices statute of the Penal Code. Mr. Newberry's most influential friends were subpoenaed and haled down to New York, as well as all of the gentlemen from whom the Senator from Ohio has made quotations against Mr. Newberry—ex-Gov. Chase S. Osborn; Lieut. Gov. Lurin D. Dickinson; Grant M. Hudson, superintendent of the Anti-Saloon League; James Sweinhart, representative of the Detroit News; Louise De Lamater, stenographer; and Jay Hayden, representative of the Detroit News.

Then they called the following Newberry people: H. A. Hopkins, director of publicity for the Newberry committee; Paul R. Dalley, attorney; Milton Oakman, ex-county clerk, Wayne County; Guy Ingalls, city treasurer elect, Detroit; C. L. Sibben, stenographer; Margaret Nevin, stenographer; and Florence Shapiro, stenographer.

All of these people testified before the grand jury which was called for the purpose of investigating the charges of fraud which Mr. Dickinson and Mr. Osborn had made against Mr. Newberry. Finally they called upon Mr. Frank W. Blair. He was treasurer, as I believe, of the Newberry committee and is president of the Union Trust Co., of Detroit. They also called upon Mr. Allan A. Templeton, president of the Seamless Steel Tube Co., of Detroit, and Mr. Thomas P. Phillips, editor of the St. Clair Republican. Those three men refused to testify under advice of their attorneys, as I understand, believing that they were not compelled to do so under the law.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VARDAMAN in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Certainly.

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator who the attorney was who gave that advice?

Mr. TOWNSEND. To what attorney does the Senator refer?

Mr. POMERENE. To the attorney for Mr. Newberry.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think it was the Hon. Martin W. Littleton. I do not think he was Mr. Newberry's attorney.

Mr. POMERENE. Was he the attorney who advised these witnesses?

Mr. TOWNSEND. My understanding is that the attorneys advised them with regard to this matter.

Mr. POMERENE. I do not care to interrupt the Senator's statement, but I want to call attention to another fact. As I understand, Mr. Newberry in the summer and fall of 1918 was living temporarily in New York?

Mr. TOWNSEND. He was. He was the commander in the third naval district. One of his sons was in the Army and the other was in the Navy. I am glad the Senator from Ohio asked me that question. Mr. Newberry was stationed in New York, and did not go into Michigan during the campaign, although some affidavits are with the committee to the effect that the commander was in Michigan. The affidavits were mistaken.

But they called all these people down there to testify, and these three men refused to do so. I understand that Mr. Truman Newberry and Mr. John Newberry, the brother who had subscribed the largest amount of the campaign money, were in New York and were not even called upon to testify. Immediately the three men who refused to testify were committed for contempt of court. They were released on a writ of habeas corpus. The writs were contested before Judge Clayton, the circuit judge. He dissolved them and remanded the men to jail. An appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, and it was argued last week here in that court. Its decision will determine the validity of the corrupt-practices act, so far as it relates to senatorial primaries, and may settle the contention of this case.

Meanwhile the grand jury, which had all the facts that have been alleged in the statement by the Senator from Ohio, refused to return a true bill, and that fact was kept secret. Representatives of the Department of Justice held it secret with the hope, I verily believe, that it would have its effect upon the voters in Michigan just the same, because Mr. Newberry was practically being tried for corruption, but hoping that that trial would be considered as still in existence after

the grand jury had been dismissed. One of the jurymen, however, stated the fact that the jury stood 16 to 1 unopposed to any action against Mr. Newberry. That was published finally in the State of Michigan, and that juror was haled into court for contempt, but was afterwards dismissed.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

Mr. POMERENE. The question I assume was, as I understand the issue in this case, as to whether or not this was a correct affidavit. Necessarily the members of the committee would have some information touching those incidents.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not know to what the Senator from Ohio refers.

Mr. POMERENE. The witnesses who were found guilty of contempt did not testify before the grand jury.

Mr. TOWNSEND. No.

Mr. POMERENE. So that the grand jury did not have the benefit of whatever information they may or may not have had.

Mr. TOWNSEND. No, Mr. President, these three witnesses did not testify. It was a test case on these three witnesses, but all the people who had to do with the fund or the management of the campaign outside of the office, and some of those in the office, did testify, and they testified to all these statements of complaint. Mr. Ford's friends called the men by whom they hoped to prove those alleged facts and had them sworn, but the jury found no cause for action; yet, I repeat, that fact was held secret until by accident it came out that Mr. Newberry was relieved of the charge that was made against him of having indulged in corruption—either he or his friends.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes.

Mr. MOSES. Will the Senator from Michigan be good enough to state by whose orders this secrecy was maintained?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I can not tell; I do not know by whose order it was done. I simply know secrecy was employed. The Senator may imagine that I am indulging in suspicion when I put 2 and 2 together; but when I remember the origin of Mr. Ford's candidacy and close it with his statement in Los Angeles the other day, that he would spend a million to keep Mr. Newberry out of the Senate, I can understand that this may have been a part of the scheme to defeat Mr. Newberry in that election which was being waged at the time, and, failing in that, to keep him out of the Senate.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. TOWNSEND. If the Senator desires to deny that, I will yield.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will continue to yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. Does the Senator from Michigan know the name of the presiding judge in these proceedings—whether he was a judge for the district in which the proceedings were held, or whether he was an outside judge who had been brought in there to hold this term?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think Judge Clayton does not belong to the southern district of New York; and he was the presiding judge.

Mr. MOSES. Does the Senator from Michigan know from what judicial district Judge Clayton comes?

Mr. TOWNSEND. He comes from the Alabama district, whichever that is. I do not remember the number of the judicial district which includes Alabama.

Mr. MOSES. Had Judge Clayton been sitting regularly in the court when this proceeding was had?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not know.

Mr. MOSES. I do not wish to break in upon the Senator's argument, but I have heard that judges from outside jurisdictions are frequently called to sit in the Federal courts in New York for reasons which it may be improper to discuss here, but which in cases like this would justify many deductions.

Mr. POMERENE. I am not able to hear what the Senator from New Hampshire is saying.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. My understanding was that one branch of this case was tried before some judge who is resident in New York and another branch of it came before Judge Clayton. Judge Clayton is one of the judges who is constantly ordered into other jurisdictions to try cases.

Mr. TOWNSEND. He was ordered into this jurisdiction, anyway; that is certain.

Mr. POMERENE. And it is hardly a fair inference, knowing Judge Clayton as we do, to suggest that he would be guilty of any improper conduct on the bench.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am not suggesting it.

Mr. POMERENE. Allow me to make a further suggestion. I know nothing about the so-called secrecy of the proceedings to which the Senator refers, but I do know a little something about the practice which prevails. Where a criminal case is not pending on a transcript, it is not usual to give publicity to any grand-jury proceedings, so that even if these proceedings were secret, it was simply the practice which prevailed in every other inquiry.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It fitted pretty well in this scheme, if there was a scheme. I disclaim any—

Mr. POMERENE. The Senator, of course, can draw any inference he desires.

Mr. TOWNSEND. One moment. I disclaim any attempt or disposition to discredit Judge Clayton, with whom I served in the other House and for whom I have great respect. I am simply reciting the facts. The Senator from New Hampshire asked me who presided, and I told him.

Mr. President, as I stated a moment ago, this case is going to take a long while to present. I have some papers which I wish to produce at the proper time and read to the Senate, touching the Ford activities in the campaign, touching the classes of advertisements that were used, and everything that was done, as well as what was done by Mr. Newberry and his friends.

I ought to say, in answer to one statement of the Senator from Ohio, that I doubt if he has any affidavit or any statement worthy of the least credence which shows that Mr. Newberry's friends have tried to destroy any evidence. There is evidence—and I shall present it to the Senate—in the form of affidavits that the Federal Government, through some of its representatives, indulged in the most unconscionable and improper methods imaginable to get evidence against Mr. Newberry, but obtained nothing of value. I shall be able to show to the Senate that representatives of Mr. Ford, but claiming to be representatives of the Federal Government or of some agency of the Government, went to various county clerks who had the custody of the ballots and the election records and sought to investigate or to look into those ballots, and in some cases took the records out of the office and carried them away into some secret room.

I have in mind one case in particular, where they came into the clerk's office when there was a girl in charge, the clerk being out, and represented to her that they were legal officers of the Government, entitled to all of the papers connected with the election. So she handed over to them the election returns, the tally sheets, and everything of that kind, and they took them out of the office. When the clerk returned, he went out after the records and brought them back, but not until these agents had had them for some time. If there has been any effort to tamper with the ballots and election returns in Michigan, it has not been exerted by Mr. Newberry's friends.

I think I speak for Mr. Newberry when I say that he courts the fullest investigation as to the election and as to the primary, if an investigation as to the primary shall be held valid, at the proper time and by the proper court. He joined with Mr. Ford's attorney to preserve the ballots. He it was who instituted the proceedings providing for a State law to preserve the ballots, for fear the objection might be raised that the Federal court did not have jurisdiction over the matter. He stands ready now, as do his friends, to disclose the facts before the proper tribunal; but, Mr. President, this Senate shall not with my consent—and if it is done it must be done with my utmost opposition—go out and investigate this case ex parte for the purpose of trying to shape public sentiment that may be able to operate upon the next Senate, which is to convene after March 4.

Mr. REED. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SWANSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield.

Mr. REED. The Senator used the expression "this Senate shall not with my consent go out and investigate this case ex parte." Does the Senator mean that anybody proposes to go out and conduct an investigation where both sides shall not have the privilege of being represented?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have no faith in an investigation that would be made at this time. I will say that to the Senator.

Mr. REED. That is highly complimentary to the membership of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. TOWNSEND. It has been represented here by some Senators that all they wanted to do was to preserve the testimony, which was likely to be lost. That is not the attitude of the Senator from Ohio. He desires to go out and take all the testimony he can in reference to this case. Now, necessarily there is not enough time to take all the testimony before the Congress ends. I feel sure, however, that an effort will be made to make a case against Mr. Newberry. So far as the ballots are concerned, of course they could not be counted in a year, if that is what is intended. Those 438,000 ballots, in 2,166 ballot boxes scattered all over Michigan, could not be counted in a year, and it is not the intention to count them. The Senator says he wants to preserve some of those stub checks in Detroit. Oh, they will all be preserved; there is no disposition to destroy them. The very witnesses who, it is stated, did not testify are among the very highest class of gentlemen in the State of Michigan.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. TOWNSEND. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. POMERENE. Is the statement correct, that I made on the authority of representations laid before the committee, to the effect that the correspondence of this campaign committee had been burned?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I presume so—a good deal of it. Does the Senator know a campaign committee on earth that preserves all of its correspondence which has accumulated during a campaign? Does the Senator do that?

Mr. POMERENE. Yes, Mr. President; I have all of my correspondence, or did have, for a considerable time after the election.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is the most remarkable statement I ever heard in my life. I have had some experience in campaigns—

Mr. POMERENE. I never had anything to cover up.

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; probably not. That induces me to say something that comes into my mind, but I guess I will not do so.

Mr. POMERENE. I do not want that to be misunderstood. I did not mean that as referring to the Senator, of course.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I know that it is absolutely true that campaign committees do not keep their correspondence for months after an election where there has not been the slightest suggestion that there is any part of it which will ever be needed. It can not be done, and it is not done. But there will be nothing more destroyed. If you want anything that has not already been destroyed, as the Senator suggests, you can enjoin through the State courts the destruction of anything that is necessary in this proposed hearing or investigation.

I believe that the Senator is laboring under a great misapprehension if he believes that there is anything in this campaign on the part of Mr. Newberry and his friends that they want to cover up. I believe that they made a truthful statement as to the expenditure of money. It was too much money, but they believed they had a right to spend what they did in advertising. Why did they feel that way?

Mr. Ford is probably the best-advertised man in the United States outside of public life, and is better advertised than most men in public life. He spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in 1916 advertising his peace propaganda and the reelection of Mr. Wilson. He has advertised in every section of the United States, and especially in Michigan. He has a Ford agency in every little hamlet in our State, and I shall show from the affidavits here that those agencies generally were Ford's headquarters during both the primary and the election campaign. I shall show that, while the records disclose, according to his report in Wayne County, that only about \$1,800 were subscribed to his personal campaign fund by his friends—and his friends constitute those who have business relations with him, the men who contract to furnish him wheels, auto bodies, and other parts for his cars—contributed generously to the Democratic State central committee, and that committee employed its efforts largely to elect Mr. Ford.

I repeat that one pamphlet alone issued by the Ford people in his campaign is reported to have cost more than is returned by the Democratic State central committee and the Ford senatorial committee put together.

I am not using this as an argument to excuse Mr. Newberry if he has violated the law, because I know that it is no excuse for a wrongful act that some one else has done a similar thing; but I am thinking of the candidate who was running against him. That candidate was advertised all over the State of Michigan. He has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in accomplishing it. He had 45,000 employees, and those employees were notified by their superintendents that Mr. Ford was a candidate for the Senate.

Mr. Newberry had the Federal employees against him. There probably were 10,000 of them in Michigan. For some strange reason—

Mr. REED. And the State employees for him and the county employees for him, I presume?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not know about that; some of them probably were, but they were legitimately interested in the campaign, but I am talking about the forces arrayed against Mr. Newberry. Another strange thing that I wish to suggest is this: The President put Mr. Ford into the race for Senator. The President had openly opposed the election of the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], because he thought that Senator had not always supported his war measures. The President went into the State of Georgia to defeat the junior Senator from that State [Mr. HARDWICK], because he alleged that Senator was not loyal; he went into Mississippi to defeat the junior Senator from that State [Mr. VARDAMAN] for the same reason. Yet, he took up Mr. Ford in our State, who had approved of all of the opposition that was made to the war measures and would not be able to stand the acid test of any war proposition, and asked the people of our State to nominate that man as Senator from Michigan. Mr. Newberry had those influences against him.

There is another strange thing, which I shall show at the proper time. We have a list of the subscribers to the Ford campaign fund filed in Michigan. I think something over 100 postmasters subscribed to the fund; that is, to the fund of the Democratic State central committee, which was in reality the Ford fund. A peculiar thing occurred in regard to that. In looking over the list I found subscriptions of \$33.33, \$61, \$70, and all kinds of peculiar sums, which I thought were very strange to be put down on a subscription blank. I had some of them figured out. In one county, for instance, it was found that all of the subscriptions were exactly 1½ per cent of the salaries paid to those officers. In another county the subscriptions paid by the postmasters subscribing to the fund amounted exactly to 3 per cent. There was method in it; there is no doubt about that.

Mr. Newberry had all of those influences against him. His committee believed that under the law they could advertise and circulate any amount of publicity literature in the State of Michigan. Mr. Newberry's friends believed that could be done legally, and they did it; but I am informed and believe that not one dollar was expended to corrupt a voter.

Mr. Ford advertised his influence. He advertised his benefactions. He advertised the assumed fact that he was going to turn over his profits out of his war contracts to the Government. Why, you and I know that under the bill that is now pending 80 per cent of those profits will be taken in taxes anyway by the Government. But he now states in his interview in California that he can not control the minority members of the company, and he does not know what they are going to do with their share of the profits, but it is his share, of course, that he is disposing of for political purposes; and 80 per cent of that already has the Government lien upon it.

Mr. President, I mention this not as an excuse for any improper expenditure of money, because if it has been improper I shall not countenance it; but I am thinking of the kind of a campaign they had in Michigan. It was not the campaign of a poor man against a rich one.

It was the campaign of a man of the greatest influence, the best-advertised man in our State, against a man who was not personally known by our people. During the Spanish War he enlisted in the Navy and served through it. He was afterwards made Assistant Secretary of the Navy, and then, by Mr. Roosevelt, made Secretary of the Navy. When the late war broke out, he enlisted in the Navy again, and was made a commander in the third naval district. His boys entered the service, as I have stated. His life has been honorable and distinguished by exalted service to his country. His high character has never been questioned. His honor and integrity have never been impeached. He has, however, never mixed politically with our people. He became a candidate for Senator while he was serving in the Navy, and the only way that he could reach the people, as against the influence of Mr. Ford, was through the press; and his friends used that press most liberally. There is, however, very little difference between the amount of advertising space he occupied and that which was occupied by Mr. Ford. The only difference is that Mr. Newberry's committee reported \$176,000 expenditures, and Mr. Ford reported through his committee \$53,000.

So, Mr. President, if this Senate feels that in a matter over which it has no proper jurisdiction it wishes to occupy the time which should be devoted to the business of this Senate, it can do so; but before we are through here the hundreds of affidavits which I have that bear on this subject shall be presented to the Senate, because, as I said before, Mr. Newberry has been attacked in the Senate, and the other side must be shown. I be-

lieve in fair play, and if public sentiment is sought it must be intelligently bared.

That is my position, Mr. President. I do not wish anybody to understand that I wish to stand in the way of rapid, speedy, intelligent consideration of legislation that the country needs. The Post Office appropriation bill, which it is proposed to displace by this political measure—because, I care not what you say about it, it is nothing else than that—should be considered and completed.

Great emergencies growing out of reconstruction, the problems which are on our hands for solution, have no business to be laid aside for the purpose of making an investigation that may be ignored by the next Senate. It may absolutely ignore the whole of your work and have another committee investigate, and we will have spent thousands of dollars in a vain thing, the result being simply to incite partisan feeling and possibly prejudice, when there should be no prejudice in the trial of a case before the next Senate.

Mr. President, I have said this because I have felt that some of these facts should be known. The statement of the Senator from Ohio has compelled me to say this much in reply. I shall be more explicit if the resolution is taken up. I have prepared this case in due form, systematically, having affidavits bearing upon all the points which I desire to present to the Senate, and if it is your pleasure to take up this resolution now and displace all of the proper legislation of the Senate, I am prepared to go ahead with it.

Mr. President, I ask consent to insert as a part of my remarks the temporary restraining order and the permanent injunction order issued by both our Federal courts, and also a copy of the Michigan statute which was passed this week.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House enrolled act 1.

An act to provide for the preservation of ballots cast for the office of United States Senator in cases of contested elections, or in cases where notices of contested elections may be given, or in cases where any judicial proceedings may have been instituted preliminary to contesting elections to the office of United States Senator.

The people of the State of Michigan enact:

SECTION 1. Whenever the election of a United States Senator is contested before the United States Senate, or notice of a contested election for United States Senator may be given, or whenever any judicial proceeding may be instituted preliminary to a contested election involving the right to a seat in said United States Senate from the State of Michigan, and it shall be made to appear to the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan that there is danger that the ballot boxes used in the election of said United States Senator within said State will not be properly preserved, the seals upon said boxes interfered with, said ballot boxes opened or the ballots therein interfered with or destroyed, such supreme court shall grant a restraining order directed to the officers having custody of said ballot boxes within said State restraining them and all other persons from interfering with said boxes, seals, or locks thereon, or the ballots therein except as therein provided.

SEC. 2. Application for such restraining order may be made by any candidate for such office and shall be made by petition duly verified under oath setting up the material facts relative to the election and the election contest involved. Such petition shall be heard in open court, and the court shall give such notice of the hearing on such application as it shall deem sufficient to the candidates for the office of United States Senator in the election concerning which the application was filed and to such persons as shall be named in such application. Pending such hearing any justice of the supreme court may, in his discretion, grant a temporary order restraining any interference with said ballot boxes or the ballots therein.

SEC. 3. Service of any restraining order may be made personally, as in the case of the service of other process of said court, or such service may be made by registered mail. In cases of emergency, notice of the issuance of a restraining order may be given to the officers to whom the same is directed by telegraph or by telephone in advance of the actual service of said order, and after such notice, whether by telegraph or telephone, said officers shall be charged with the same duty with regard to the preservation of said ballot boxes and the ballots therein as after the service of said order.

SEC. 4. On being served with a copy of a permanent restraining order issued by said court, it shall be the duty of all officers having the custody of ballot boxes containing ballots cast at said election for said office forthwith to deliver the same to the county clerks of the counties in which such officers reside. It shall be the duty of said county clerks to receive such ballot boxes containing such ballots and to receipt therefor to the officers so delivering them. Said county clerks shall thereupon deposit said ballot boxes containing said ballots in some secure place to await the action of the commissioners herein provided for.

SEC. 5. Upon issuing permanent restraining order as herein provided, the supreme court shall name three commissioners who shall proceed to the offices of the several county clerks as soon as may be, open said ballot boxes, remove the ballots therefrom, place them in packages securely wrapped and sealed and so marked as to show in what voting districts such ballots were cast.

SEC. 6. Such packages shall be sealed by said commissioners and redeposited with said county clerks, and it shall be the duty of said county clerks to again place said packages of ballots in some secure place pending the further order of the court. It shall also be the duty of said commissioners to make a statement, duly signed by them, to be included within each such package, as to the character and condition of the ballot boxes when opened by them as herein provided, and of the condition of the ballots within such boxes. Each county clerk shall thereupon notify the several officers of election within the county that

such ballot boxes have been released and direct such officers of election to appear and secure said boxes.

SEC. 7. The commissioners, as herein provided for, shall give public notice of the time when they will appear at each county seat for the purpose of removing the ballots from the ballot boxes, as herein provided, and such removal shall be publicly made in the presence of the county clerk and judge of probate in the office of the county clerk during office hours.

SEC. 8. It shall be the right of each candidate to the office of United States Senator at such election to be present in person at such removal, or to be represented thereat.

SEC. 9. The compensation of the commissioners herein provided for shall be fixed by the Supreme Court and such court shall allow such traveling and personal expenses of such commissioners as it may deem proper. All allowances to commissioners shall be taxed by the court as costs in the proceeding.

SEC. 10. Any officer who shall violate the terms of any such restraining order shall be in contempt of court and shall, in addition to such penalty as may be imposed thereby, be liable to a fine of \$1,000.

SEC. 11. Instead of filing the petition for relief provided for in this act with the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan application may be made in like manner to the circuit court for the County of Ingham, and when application is so made such court shall have full jurisdiction to make all orders, name the commissioners, and otherwise exercise all necessary authority to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 12. It is the intention of this act to furnish a speedy and effective means for the preservation of evidence of the intention of voters in the case of elections to the office of United States Senator. It is remedial in character and shall be construed in such manner as fully to carry out the intention herein expressed.

This act is ordered to take immediate effect.

[United States of America. In the District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Michigan, Southern Division. In equity.]

Henry Ford, plaintiff, v. Truman H. Newberry, Richard Lindsay, William P. Rutledge, Delos Newcomb, Herbert Gay et al., defendants. No. 287.

The plaintiff herein by his counsel this day presented his verified bill of complaint with affidavit attached thereto (filed herein Dec. 30, 1918), wherein prayer is made for the preservation of the ballots cast in the eastern district of Michigan for the office of United States Senator at the general election held in the State of Michigan on November 5, 1918, and likewise for the preservation of the ballot boxes containing said ballots, together with all poll books and tally sheets relating to such election;

And it being made to appear that Hon. Arthur J. Tuttle, United States district judge for the Eastern District of Michigan, is now absent from said district;

Now, upon motion of Lucking, Helfman, Lucking & Hanlon, attorneys for Henry Ford, the above-named plaintiff, and pursuant to the power vested by section 264 of the Judicial Code of the United States:

Ordered, That Truman H. Newberry, Richard Lindsay, William P. Rutledge, Delos Newcomb, and Herbert Gay, and all other city clerks, township clerks, village clerks, and officials in the various cities, townships, villages and voting districts in the eastern district of the State of Michigan having in their possession or custody ballots cast in their respective cities, townships, villages, or voting districts in the November 5, 1918, election held in the State of Michigan for the office of United States Senator from the State of Michigan, and the boxes containing such ballots and the poll books and tally sheets relating to such election, show cause, if any there be, in this court on the 9th day of January, 1919, at 10 o'clock in the forenoon of said day, why an order of injunction should not issue herein restraining them, and each of them, and their agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and those in active concert or participating with them, from opening, destroying, or injuring the ballot boxes containing the ballots cast in the eastern district of Michigan for the office of United States Senator at the general election held in Michigan on November 5, 1918, and from removing, interfering with, or destroying the ballots cast at the November 5, 1918, election held in Michigan for the office of the United States Senator, and the poll books and tally sheets relating thereto, until the further order of this court.

It appearing to this court that there is danger that the ballots, ballot boxes, poll books, tally sheets, and election records relating to the election held in the eastern district of Michigan on November 5, 1918, for the office of United States Senator from said State of Michigan, will be destroyed, removed, injured, or tampered with, if no restraining order issue, without notice to the defendants prior to the return date of the aforesaid order to show cause, and that if service of notice be required and a hearing had upon the prayer for an injunction herein before issuance of any injunction or restraining order herein, immediate and irreparable injury, loss, and damage will result to the aforesaid Henry Ford, plaintiff herein.

It is hereby ordered that Truman H. Newberry, Richard Lindsay, William P. Rutledge, Delos Newcomb, and Herbert Gay, and all other city clerks, township clerks, village clerks, and officials in the various cities, townships, villages, and voting districts in the eastern district of the State of Michigan having in their possession or custody ballots cast in their respective cities, townships, villages, or voting districts in the November 5, 1918, election for the office of United States Senator from the State of Michigan, their agents, servants, employees, attorneys, and those in active concert or participating with them refrain from opening, destroying, or injuring the boxes containing the ballots cast at the aforesaid election of November 5, 1918, until the further order of this court, and further refrain until further order of this court from injuring, removing, interfering with, or destroying the ballots cast in the eastern district of Michigan at the November 5, 1918, election held in Michigan for the office of United States Senator, and that they and each of them do carefully preserve and safeguard the said ballots in the original ballot boxes in which they were deposited on said election day under lock and seal, together with all poll books and tally sheets relating to said election until further order of this court.

It is further ordered that notice of the issuance of this order may be served upon any and all custodians of said ballots and ballot boxes and records by personal service of a copy hereof or by registered mail or by notice actually given.

It is further ordered that a copy of the bill of complaint herein and of this order be served personally on or before Friday, January 3, 1919, upon each of the defendants, Truman H. Newberry, Richard Lindsay, William P. Rutledge, Delos Newcomb, and Herbert Gay.

The foregoing orders are granted, subject to requirement of plaintiff forthwith to present a bond of indemnity in the sum of \$500 and conditioned upon the payment of such costs and damages as may be in-

curréd or suffered by any party who may be found to have been wrongfully enjoined or restrained by the provisions of this order.
Approved for entry at Cincinnati, Ohio, this 31st day of December, 1918, at 4:15 o'clock p. m.

J. W. WARRINGTON,
United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Judicial Circuit.

[United States of America in the district court of the United States for the western district of Michigan, southern division.]
Henry Ford, plaintiff, v. Truman H. Newberry, Joseph C. Schinkman, et al., defendants. No. 1896. In equity.

At a session of said court held in the city of Grand Rapids, Kent County, Mich., on the 21st day of January, A. D. 1919.

Present: The Hon. Clarence W. Sessions, district judge.

On reading the stipulation which has been entered into between complainant and Truman H. Newberry, reading as follows, viz:

"In the Senate of the United States re petition of Henry Ford, in re senatorial election in Michigan.

"The parties, by their counsel, will and do hereby stipulate in the two cases between the parties pending in the eastern and western districts of Michigan, respectively, that orders may be entered and shall forthwith be entered, if the courts approve, that the injunctions shall be continued in full force as heretofore granted until such time as the Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate may and shall take possession of the ballots and all the contents, records, and the like in the ballot boxes, including poll books, tally sheets, etc.

"That the procedure of the taking possession by the Sergeant at Arms shall be fixed by the United States Senate, and the representatives of each party shall be present when the transfer of the ballots and papers shall be made from the boxes to the custody of the Sergeant at Arms.

"It is understood that action shall be taken to transfer ballots, etc., from the boxes in time so that the boxes may be used at the approaching April elections.

"It is understood that this stipulation does not foreclose or prejudice either party as to the other matters contended for by them, respectively.

"(Signed) HENRY FORD,
"By ALFRED LUCKING,
"His Counsel."
"HENRY E. BODMAN,
"Counsel for Truman H. Newberry."

And the court being advised in the premises, it is hereby ordered that the restraining order heretofore entered and issued out of this court on the 28th day of December, 1918, be, and the same is hereby, continued in full force as heretofore granted until such time as the Sergeant at Arms of the United States Senate may and shall take possession of the ballots and all the contents, records, and the like in the ballot boxes, including poll books, tally sheets, etc., relating to the November 5, 1918, election for United States Senator from the State of Michigan, and until the further order of this court.

It is further ordered that the foregoing order shall not prevent the use of the aforesaid ballot boxes by any of the other defendants when necessary for lawful election purposes, and that this court reserves authority to permit the use of said boxes for lawful election purposes.

Approved for entry.

C. W. SESSIONS,
United States District Judge.

O. K. LUCKING, HELFMAN, LUCKING & HANLON,
Attorneys for Henry Ford:

This order is satisfactory and I will be in court at the opening session, Tuesday, January 21, 1919, to ask that it be entered.

J. O. MURFIN,
Attorney for T. H. Newberry.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Western District of Michigan, Southern Division, ss:

I, Chas. J. Potter, clerk of the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Michigan, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and compared copy of the order continuing restraining order in force as approved for entry in the proceedings of said court in said entitled cause and of the whole thereof.

Witness my official signature and the seal of the said court at Grand Rapids this 29th day of January, A. D. 1919.

[SEAL] CHAS. J. POTTER, Clerk.
By CHAS. L. FITCH, Deputy.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I can follow the Senator's example by expressing regret, as he did, at the attitude taken. He expressed regret at the attitude taken by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE], and I must express regret at the attitude taken by the Senator from Michigan.

If I can have the attention of the Senate, I want to state my position on this case.

As everybody knows, I am a Democrat. I am a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. After the primary in Michigan, and before the election, an effort was made to cause an investigation of the Michigan case. A great deal of talk and comment was had in the newspapers with regard to the large expenditure of money in that State. I took a pronounced position against having an investigation at that time, because it seemed to me that, while clearly within the jurisdiction of the Senate under some of its powers, such an investigation would have the inevitable effect of influencing the election, and that, if it was tried in an artful way, one side might be presented to the voters before the election and the other side have no opportunity to be heard. Therefore I took the position that it was not fair at that time to investigate, although I believed that we had the absolute right to investigate that question, if under no other power, under the broad right that the Senate has, through any of its committees, to investigate any public matter which may demand public legislation, a right which we are exercising every day, and under which a half dozen committees are at this moment proceeding.

After the election was held I took the position, and I still take the position, that, assuming that the credentials of Mr. Newberry are in proper and legal form, upon their being filed here with the Senate he is entitled, at any time after the 4th of March, to take his oath of office and to take his seat, and to retain that seat until and unless the Senate of the United States, upon proper proceedings, shall oust him therefrom.

I make this statement because I want it understood that, so far as I am concerned, I have tried to assume, if it is possible for me to assume, a judicial attitude—the attitude that ought to be assumed by every Member of the Senate, not only now, but throughout the course of these proceedings, until the final vote. It may be too much to expect from flesh and blood, although, since all the world is to become good and perfectly unselfish, possibly a little medium of it might get into the Senate Chamber.

But now the case takes another phase. A contest, or protest in the nature of a contest, is duly filed with the Senate, and that is referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for such proper action as it may see fit to take. The committee met, called before it the counsel of the two contending parties, and these gentlemen agreed, first, that they were willing to preserve the ballots, and agreed upon orders of court which were to be entered prohibiting the destruction of the ballots; and until last evening I had assumed, and assumed upon the strength of telegrams that had been sent to the committee, that those court orders broadly preserved the ballots intact until such time as the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate of the United States should take them into his possession. But it now appears that, at least in one district, the order, while reciting the conditions I have just stated, added this clause, in substance and effect: That the ballots must be taken by the Sergeant at Arms before the next election, and as the next election occurs early in April, the situation presented is that the Sergeant at Arms has no authority to take those ballots, and will have no authority to take those ballots, until after the next election, unless this Senate shall grant him that authority by the passage of this resolution, and orders to be issued thereunder. That is to say, if we do not pass this resolution between now and next April and take possession of these ballots between now and next April, the ballots will, in the judicial district to which I am referring, be destroyed, because another election is to be held.

Mr. SWANSON. Is that a Federal judicial district?

Mr. REED. A Federal judicial district—one-half of the State, I assume. There is an eastern and a western district, if I am correctly informed.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The same injunction is in force by both courts, in both districts.

Mr. REED. The same exception is invoked, then.

Mr. President, that presents this question: In order to preserve these ballots this Senate must take action. Now, I am taking a statement that was made to me as to the contents of this decree. I have not myself examined the original decree, but I saw what purported to be a copy, and I guess it will be found that I am not mistaken. Therefore, the question which lies at the threshold is, Shall these ballots be permitted to be destroyed for want of a Senate resolution giving authority to investigate, and authority, under the investigation, for the Sergeant at Arms to take possession of the ballots?

It is true that we are now told, and it is the first information I have had—and, of course, I accept the word of the Senator from Michigan—that the legislature has passed an act which allows certain proceedings to be taken, and which, it is assumed on the face, can authorize some method of saving the ballots; but we do not know whether or not the jurisdiction there will be challenged, whether or not the principle of law will be invoked that has once been invoked in Michigan, namely, that the State authorities have no jurisdiction or control over the election of men to the United States Senate, which I understand to be the rulings of their courts. If that principle is invoked, the question may arise, and very likely will arise, whether this statute is itself constitutional.

Therefore the only safe thing to do, the only prudent thing to do, is to get possession of these ballots. All that I have said now, with reference to getting possession of the ballots applies to any other kind of documentary evidence, and it applies also to any class of evidence which is likely to be lost or destroyed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McKELLAR in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. Do I understand that the Senator thinks that a State has no right to preserve ballots cast in the State for a State officer?

Mr. REED. Oh, for State officers, yes.

Mr. LODGE. They are all on one ballot.

Mr. REED. That is true; but, as I understand the law—and the Senator will permit me to say that I only heard the proposed bill read before our committee some weeks ago—that bill gives to the aggrieved party, or a party claiming to be aggrieved, the right to go into court; and the party in this instance would be the candidate for the United States Senate. Now, I do not say that that point is accurate. I did not rise here to argue the legal question. It is a matter upon which I might change my own mind. I am now discussing the question of the propriety of saving this evidence, the fact that it is the safe method to pursue; and I am here to claim not only that it is the proper thing to do, but that every honest man ought to want to help keep this evidence.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri further yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. LODGE. I never heard of this law of Michigan until I heard it stated by the Senator from Michigan on the floor this afternoon, but I now have it in my hand. It is—

A bill to provide for the preservation of ballots cast for the office of United States Senator in cases of contested elections, or in cases where notices of contested elections may be given, or in cases where any judicial proceedings may have been instituted preliminary to contesting elections to the office of United States Senator.

And then comes the bill, which is quite a long and elaborate one, and which seems, as well as I can tell by glancing at it, to cover everything pretty thoroughly. I should think it would be well to have it printed in the Record, where we could all see it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I want to say that I propose to have that bill, together with these orders, inserted in the Record. That bill has an amendment to it which gave it immediate effect, and which does not appear on the copy which was sent to me. That is all the difference there is. The bill takes immediate effect, and I am going to ask to have it put in the Record.

Mr. REED. I understand the statement of the Senator from Massachusetts with regard to the bill, but the point I am making is this, and I am simply suggesting it. I am not giving it as an opinion, for I have had no opportunity to examine the Michigan authorities. It has been stated to me—indeed, it was stated in argument before the committee—that the courts of Michigan had held that they had no authority over any contest or over any election concerning a Congressman or a Senator, and that that was a question of jurisdiction.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, on that point I see that this bill provides, in section 11, as follows:

Instead of filing the petition for relief provided for in this act with the Supreme Court of the State of Michigan, application may be made in like manner to the circuit court for the county of Ingham, and when application is so made such court shall have full jurisdiction to make all orders, name commissioners, and otherwise exercise all necessary authority to carry out the purposes of this act.

I assume that that is the circuit court of the United States, is it not?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; the provision is that the application may be made to our State circuit court.

Mr. LODGE. It is the State circuit court, then.

Mr. REED. I shall probably have these decisions before I take my seat, and I shall be glad to return to that subject.

Mr. President, I am indifferent to that question. I repeat what I said, that every honest man ought to want to have the honest evidence in this case before the Senate at the proper time for its consideration, and that every scrap of that evidence should be preserved. Now, there may be differences of opinion between honest men as to how the evidence should be preserved and who should preserve it, but as to the main question I repeat that no honest man wants anything except all of the evidence in this case preserved and presented at the proper time.

That brings us to the question of what is the proper time to get the evidence. Every man who has ever tried half a dozen lawsuits knows that the proper time to get the evidence is just as soon after the occurrence as you can get on the ground with legal authority to act. The recollections of witnesses are fresh; the documents have not been destroyed or forgotten; perjury has not yet been devised, generally speaking; and the opportunity to get at the truth is so much greater, because of the proximity to the time, that unless there are overmastering difficulties time should never be allowed to lapse. Particularly in a case involving fraud or crime I have often remarked that I would give more for the first 10 days than for the next 10 years in the matter of investigation; so that from the practical standpoint the proper time is as soon as possible.

That brings us, then, to the question of who has the right to take this testimony and preserve it. I grant that it would be unfair for the present body of Senators to undertake to pass upon the qualifications of a man whose term begins on the 4th of March. Indeed, we are powerless to pass upon that question, because he does not formally present his credentials until that time. But is it possible that the Senate of the United States does not possess the power and jurisdiction to preserve the evidence in regard to a matter which concerns its very make-up and existence? Is there anybody who believes the Senate is so helpless as that?

In the first place, we are a continuing body; and, like other bodies that have brains, we take judicial notice of public events. We not only have judicial notice, but we have official notice, that an election has taken place in Michigan; and we not only have public information of which we can take judicial notice, but we have direct notice that Mr. Newberry has had his credentials issued, and that they will be presented; and we have filed, I assume, with the Secretary of the Senate, the expense accounts of the candidates for this office; and we have the right to investigate those expense accounts and find out whether the affidavits back of those expense accounts are true affidavits or are false affidavits; whether perjury is being attempted to be foisted upon this body by either one of these candidates or by anybody in their behalf. The jurisdiction of this body now to investigate any affidavit filed with its Secretary and to investigate the truth of that affidavit can hardly be denied by anybody. It seems to me inconceivable that it should be denied.

But, Mr. President, counsel for both sides in this case appeared before the committee and each of them protested that he desired to preserve all of the evidence in the case. I am taking no side in this case. I am simply insisting upon the right and duty of the Senate to preserve this evidence and to get it as soon as possible, but I say the only proper thing for lawyers to do and for Senators to do, whether they represent merely as friends or partisans, or whether they represent as paid counsel—and of course Senators do not do that; I do not mean that—either one of these contestants, the only proper attitude for honest men to take is that they want the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. Any man who gets in any other attitude than that will go far toward convincing me and toward convincing others that his client or his friend or the man whose cause he advocates has to hide from the truth.

Now, why have these attempts been made to delay? I say it with a good deal of sorrow, but I have witnessed tactics here that seem to me like the tactics of lawyers playing for a continuance in a bad case. Particularly when you get near the end of a term of court, you frequently find that the attorney for the defendant comes into court and has a bad cold that morning, and will they not please put off the case until the next day? The next day some little trifling thing happens and the next day something else, and finally the term of the court has expired.

Is it possible that any man would take the position or does take the position that this present Senate will not get the evidence honestly, and therefore they can not be trusted to get the evidence honestly? Let us see. Under this resolution, if it is passed, the Committee on Privileges and Elections will proceed probably through a subcommittee of three or five or seven men. The majority in this case would undoubtedly be Democrats, and there would be the usual minority representation for the Republicans. The committee would proceed to take the evidence. If the committee took the evidence without giving proper representation to both sides, the Senate, which would meet to pass upon that evidence, would throw it out as unworthy. If the committee refused to hear evidence that could be properly considered, the committee of the Senate that convenes after March 4 would supply that evidence. If the committee did anything that is unjust or unfair or improper, then the Senate can correct its conduct or entirely throw out the evidence. Nobody can be harmed.

A Republican Senate, organized upon the very vote of one of the contestants, and by his vote alone—that is, his vote being the determining vote—will organize the next Senate and will try the case from the evidence that is now to be gathered. If that evidence has not been properly or fairly gathered, I repeat, that body thus organized, that Committee on Privileges and Elections then organized, with that majority of Republicans greater than the Republicans have in the Senate, will proceed to consider the evidence that may be taken and submitted by the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. There would still be one vote. Strictly speaking, his vote would not be the determining vote.

Mr. REED. I stand corrected. It is not important.

Mr. LODGE. I do not think it is important.

Mr. REED. No; it is not important on the point. So no man can claim that this is an unfair proceeding unless he boldly claims that the Committee on Privileges and Elections as now constituted would do a very scurvy piece of investigating.

Mr. LODGE. May I ask the Senator a question in that connection?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. It is not in connection with the character of the committee, of which I have no doubt whatever. Does the Senator think that the committee of a Congress which has died—an expired Congress—can go on until the new Congress comes in and investigate or do any work?

Mr. REED. I have not the slightest doubt that the Senate can appoint a committee now with authority to investigate during the session of the Senate or during the recess, and that committee will continue to be a live, working committee until the next Congress is convened and organized. This is a continuing body.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; I agree.

Mr. REED. We can proceed in that way always.

Mr. LODGE. That would be a special committee, the Senator means?

Mr. REED. No; not a special committee. The Committee on Privileges and Elections, if this resolution is passed, will be proceeding under the authority of the resolution. The resolution would authorize it to proceed to investigate.

Mr. LODGE. Then the present Committee on Privileges and Elections could go right on after the 4th of March?

Mr. REED. Unless we are called together. If we are called together, then, of course, the new organization would take its place. That would displace the committee because a new committee would then be organized.

Mr. LODGE. Our rules require that the committees shall be appointed at the beginning of a Congress. I only want to know if the Senator meant that this committee would continue its investigation.

Mr. REED. No; not after the organization of the Senate.

Mr. LODGE. No; after the 4th of March? Of course, it could not act after the new organization, because there would be a different committee.

Mr. REED. After March 4, if we are not called together in extra session, and it ought.

Mr. President, I think I have said enough to make it plain that no injustice can be done.

I am sorry the Senator from Michigan has stepped out, because I wanted to reply to some things he just said. Will some one ask him to come in?

Mr. TOWNSEND entered the Chamber.

Mr. REED. I thank the Senator for coming in. The Senator from Michigan spoke of an attempt to create a political atmosphere about this investigation. As nearly as I am able to interpret or gather the Senator's thought, it is that if we began the investigation now it would have some effect upon the ultimate decision of the Senate. I beg to say that whenever this evidence is taken, whether it be taken by the present committee of the Senate or whether it is taken by a committee organized after the 4th of March, it is going to take a certain length of time to get the evidence. The minute you begin gathering the evidence, no matter what committee takes it, the effect that the Senator spoke of will follow, that is to say, the public discussion of the evidence from day to day will have its effect upon the public mind. That is a thing that is inevitable in a discussion or in an investigation and can not be escaped in any investigation unless you have it behind closed doors, and since we have "open covenants openly arrived at" I presume that will be followed even in the investigation of an election in Michigan.

Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] with all his great power and force told us about things that Mr. Ford had done and gave us pretty clearly to understand that he expected to prove when this investigation proceeds that Mr. Ford's statement of expenses is untrue, or that his committee's statement is untrue—I do not know which made the statement—that many improper things were done by Mr. Ford. The moment it was suggested that anybody had any charges to make against Mr. Ford the chairman of this committee, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] caused this resolution to be amended so that the jurisdiction of the committee would extend to cover all the irregularities in the election.

So far as I am concerned I am in a position to be the justest judge and the most disinterested individual in the world as this trial proceeds. I am told that one of these gentlemen is a rock-ribbed simon-pure Republican who never puts a pencil across the name of a Republican on a ballot. I am told that the other gentleman never wittingly voted for a Democrat. I

confess I can not see much political choice between them. I am told, in fact, I read the statement of Mr. Ford after he was nominated, that he was neither a Republican nor a Democrat, and I confess as between a man who is neither a Republican nor a Democrat and a Republican, I lean toward the Republican.

I am not interested, sir, in the protection of Mr. Ford nor in the protection of Mr. Newberry. I am interested in the protection of the American ballot box where the American voter has the one chance of a freeman to express his choice. If those ballot boxes are contaminated by the use of money or fraud or force, I do not care who is the guilty party, we owe it to ourselves, we owe it to the Senate, and we owe it to our country and to posterity that the gentleman should be brought to book. If anybody has filed any false affidavits here that fact ought to be known and nobody ought to try to cover the facts up. I do not charge that has been the case.

It seems that up in the State of Michigan we have this peculiar sort of thing. The Republicans nominated a very wealthy man, the Democrats nominated a very wealthy man, and you have got a race of two rich men for an office. I do not like it myself. I do not think riches ought to bar a man from office, but if there is no better reason for a man to run for office than that he has great riches it would be better that he should remain in private life. When you get men with great fortunes competing for these great offices you are liable to get overenthusiastic lieutenants who spend vast sums of money. It just so happens in this world that the average man who has accumulated a good many million dollars gets it into his head as an ordinary proposition that every other man has his price, and that somehow or other his money will command the souls, and consciences, and bodies of men. It is not much wonder that 1,800 years ago Jesus Christ told us that "it is easier for a camel to go through the eye of a needle than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God." I do not make indiscriminate attacks upon wealth. I am stating my position here to-day very plainly and very bluntly. When the only reason why men are picked out to run for the United States Senate is because they have a large bank account, the man who picks out that sort of a man, if he picks him out for that sort of a reason, does a disservice to his country.

Mr. President, there have been very serious charges made in this case, too serious for the Senate to postpone action; too serious for delay. There have been some things done of a very suspicious character; that is, it is charged that they have been done.

The Senator from Michigan states that it is customary to burn the papers of a political committee after an election. I do not know about that.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I said the ordinary correspondence.

Mr. REED. Yes; I do not know about that. So far as I am concerned, I have in boxes put away, I think, every political letter I ever received, and if you have any idea of writing me one that I can not dig up on you some day you had better hesitate about writing it. That is not because I am suspicious, but it is because those letters constitute the record of those times, and one never knows when he may want to go back to find out an event or to fix the name of some one who did him a service or a disservice.

It may be, however, that some committees and that, generally, committees, within a short time after an election, destroy their correspondence. But I will tell you what they do not do. They do not lock letters up in a vault and put a guard over them, and keep them locked up in that way until they have an opportunity to burn them, and then burn them; and it is charged that is exactly what took place here. I never knew of the political correspondence of an honest committee being of such a dangerous character that it had to be locked up in a vault behind a time lock and guarded until the match could turn it into ashes and the wind blow it away.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Do I understand the Senator to say that any such thing as that happened or has been charged in this case?

Mr. REED. It was charged.

Mr. TOWNSEND. They allege in their petition that these papers were destroyed before they gave any notice that there would be a contest or that they would be needed.

Mr. REED. That does not answer.

Mr. TOWNSEND. They had been already destroyed.

Mr. REED. It was charged before the committee that certain papers of this committee were kept under lock and key and guard until such time as they could be burned. They may have been perfectly innocent; it may be that this is not a fact; I am

not trying this case; I am only trying to impress upon Senators the seriousness of the charges.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Can the Senator conceive of any reason for putting the ballots under lock and key when there had been no question of suspicion? Could they not have destroyed them at any time? Why would they need to put them under lock and key?

Mr. REED. Now the Senator is inviting me into the field of psychology. I do not know what was in their mind. I can conceive of circumstances, though, that would make this exactly the course to be followed. There may be a settlement coming yet between some of these gentlemen who had handled the accounts; some of these papers may have been essential for that; and it may have been essential that they should be preserved long enough for the settlement to take place, and then very desirable that they should be burned. I simply give the Senator that as one illustration that comes to my mind at this moment.

Another charge that is made is that while \$176,000 is admitted to have been expended in a State—what is the population of the State of Michigan, I will ask the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Something like 3,000,000.

Mr. REED. In a State of about 3,000,000 population it is charged that, in addition to this, it is pretty thoroughly known that \$180,000 on the outside was expended. It is charged that one of Mr. Newberry's relatives expended \$99,900, all, I apprehend, in the interest of moral progress and reform. But I do not say that this took place; I hope that it will be disproven. It is charged, Mr. President, that there is evidence of a systematic and deliberate preparation for the making of false returns—a very ugly and nasty charge.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Missouri also know that those same charges are made against the elections in Nevada, in Montana, in Kentucky, and in Georgia?

Mr. REED. No; I never heard of this particular charge that I am speaking of in any election, except in the Michigan election.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Some of those charges are before the committee.

Mr. REED. Of course we could not try those other cases in this particular resolution, but if anybody will bring to the Senate substantial reasons for investigating other elections, I shall be ready to investigate them all.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I simply mentioned that for this reason: Every charge of fraud is accompanied with such statements. As I said before, I do not believe that anybody seriously believes that any of those practices were employed in the election in Michigan. I do not believe that there is a question about that. Those are stock terms that are used in condemnation usually of a proceeding of this kind.

Mr. REED. No, Mr. President; I am not speaking of general stock charges. I am speaking of a charge to the effect that letters can be produced showing that responsible parties, acting for Mr. Newberry or for his committee, sent out letters to men who were handling money, so phrased as to indicate to them that they were to return as expended by them only a certain amount of money, whereas in truth they had expended a much larger sum of money.

It is claimed—I do not say truthfully—that this was a system, and that it was widespread. If that is true, it would afford the most abundant reason for locking the records in a vault or for burning them quickly.

Now, the statement is made that Mr. Ford got out a pamphlet that cost eighty or ninety thousand dollars, and that the cost of that is not returned. Mr. President, if Mr. Ford got out a pamphlet that cost eighty or ninety thousand dollars and did not return it as an honest man should, unless he could very clearly show that he did not know about it, I would say that he was not fit to sit in the Senate. I will say exactly the same thing about anybody else. No man has a right to come in here with tainted title; no man has a right to enter this Chamber with an affidavit in his hand containing perjury. But this is the first time I have heard that charge. Let us find out whether Mr. Ford did it, just the same as we find out whether Mr. Newberry did certain things; and let those of you who naturally desire to have an additional colleague upon that side of the Chamber take the position we will take. Let us take the lid off, and take it off now; look at the contents and make a record, and let the results, be

what they may, only so long as they accord with the facts of the case.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I desire to state that I have not charged that Mr. Ford got out this pamphlet. I verily believe that neither Mr. Ford nor Mr. Newberry knew personally of much that was going on in their campaigns. I said that the pamphlet was issued in Mr. Ford's behalf and circulated—probably 500,000 copies of it—by first-class letter postage over the State of Michigan, in addition to the vast numbers that were circulated on the street corners of almost every city in the State of Michigan.

Mr. REED. Well, I am glad to know that that reflection is not made on Mr. Ford, as I am glad to know that no direct reflection is made on any man. I do not want any man besmirched unless he is guilty.

It is charged that Mr. Newberry filed a disclaimer with regard to any knowledge of any moneys that were expended—I think I state that correctly—and it is charged again that Mr. Newberry was in intimate and close connection with his campaign, and that he did know what was going on the same as the ordinary candidate would know. That is a question of fact to be tried. I do not know what the fact may be; but I do know that if it should transpire that Mr. Newberry had misrepresented the facts and said he did not know when he did know, that would be a very important circumstance bearing upon his right to a seat in this body.

In this connection, while I do not desire to take much of the time of the Senate, I am reminded that there is on file with the committee a document which contains this purported copy of a letter from Gov. Chase S. Osborn to Mr. Newberry. Let me read it; it is very significant. The letter is dated December 17, 1918, and is as follows:

MY DEAR COMMANDER: I have read your letter. Thank you for your sentiments. I shall support you. Already I have straightened out entanglements that would have been hurtful to your success. I am not interested in you personally a particle. The entire matter is so far beyond personal consideration and transcends individual proportions to an extent that only public welfare may be thought of. You can be elected; no doubt you will be. My idea is that the thing for you to do is to honestly confess that you broke the law and that you knew all about the campaign, but that you did not realize the enormity of your offense.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Who wrote that?

Mr. REED. Chase S. Osborn, who is governor, is he not, of Michigan?

Mr. TOWNSEND. At one time he was governor.

Mr. REED. Very well. The letter proceeds:

In such a position you would be entrenched in honesty, I fully believe. And an indulgent people would forgive you and fight for you, because of the past services they think you have given and what they have been told you are giving now. In addition this action would make for your name an honorable place in the history of Michigan. Otherwise the future will curse you.

The plea can not be honestly made that you spent money in excess because you were fighting Ford, because you had begun your reckless campaign long before Ford was mentioned and had already transgressed the law. Nor can you plead "you did not know." That would prove you to be both an ass and a liar, which I choose to think you are not. I am for you only to save the Nation and the State from the curse of Fordism. A vote for Ford is a vote for the Kaiser right now, as I view the case.

Yours, truly,

CHASE S. OSBORN.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, does the Senator understand that Mr. Osborn was called before the grand jury at New York and testified, as did Mr. Dickinson, and that the letters which have been dwelt upon by the chairman of the committee, and to which the Senator from Missouri has referred, from ex-Gov. Osborn and Lieut. Gov. Dickinson were the basis of this charge, made in the midst of a campaign, Mr. Osborn having been a candidate for the Senate at that primary and defeated?

Mr. REED. No; I do not know the political history of Michigan. I have not followed it; but it does not appear to be an unfriendly letter, because I find, a few days before that, this letter from Mr. Newberry to Mr. Osborn:

NEW YORK CITY,
Sunday, September 1, 1918.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: Your cordial telegram assuring me of your earnest support is all that was needed to insure the defeat of Ford in November. I fully realize that my personality is submerged in the issues that confront our party in our State. Many times in the past few months I have envied your ability and privilege to talk, and when your voice rang clear and strong throughout State and Nation on the menace of Ford I wanted to wire you godspeed in your patriotic work.

Your deeply appreciated telegram of support helps me to visualize the statesman, the sportsman (hunter), and gentleman that I have always known you to be.

Cordially, yours,

TRUMAN H. NEWBERRY.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, the Senator perhaps does not have—I do not think it has been submitted—the telegram

which Gov. Osborn sent to Mr. Newberry congratulating him unreservedly upon his election. The letter which the Senator has just read from Mr. Newberry was then sent, and the letter of Mr. Osborn was the result.

Mr. REED. No; I have merely these two letters.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Osborn's telegram should go before Mr. Newberry's letter.

Mr. REED. From these two letters, assuming that Mr. Newberry is of the high character that he should be, it would appear that he at least on the 1st of September certifies in most flattering terms to the high character, the intelligence, the patriotism, the public service, and so forth, ad infinitum, of one Osborn, and that 24 days later the said Osborn wrote him a very friendly and cordial letter advising him to tell the truth about these campaign expenses. It is entirely possible that Osborn may have become transformed in those 25 days from a sportsman and a thoroughbred into a sneak, who was trying to undermine his friend, but I am compelled to take the documents at their face value.

Mr. President, there is another peculiar thing about this case, and I confess it does not leave a very good taste in my mouth. Always I have maintained in elections and matters of that kind that no man ought to fear publicity; that no man ought to fear investigation. Is it not a very peculiar circumstance that when a grand jury in New York, being in the opinion of the legal advisers of the United States within its jurisdictional rights, shall undertake to investigate an election and witnesses are brought there to testify these witnesses are advised by the attorney of Mr. Newberry to defy the grand jury and to refuse to testify upon the ground that the grand jury is without jurisdiction?

Some 35 years—and I am getting old—I have practiced law somewhat actively. In all that length of time I never knew a witness to refuse to testify before a grand jury except on the ground that his evidence would tend to incriminate him or subject him to public contempt and obloquy.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Did the Senator ever know before of a grand jury that was so clearly called and used for political purposes?

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I do not know anything about this grand jury, except that a grand jury was duly called in a Federal court, impeached and sworn according to law, and that it was proceeding under the direction of a Federal judge and under the guidance of a district attorney who had sworn to uphold the Constitution and faithfully and impartially to administer the laws. That is all I know about it; but if everything is clean, if everything is fair, if everything is honest, I want to know what objection there was by these witnesses to telling the facts? And why should they, called upon only to tell the facts of their knowledge, be in consultation with the attorney of Mr. Newberry? Why should the attorney of Mr. Newberry be advising these witnesses to put padlock upon their tongues and to take jeopardy of jail rather than tell the truth? Nobody could compel them to tell anything but the truth. What was there in the truth that made it necessary for these men to place themselves in jeopardy of jail, in jeopardy of court contempt? Why this secrecy and putting off?

I hope the Senator from Michigan did not mean it, but he used some expressions here to-day which in the old days we thought always were a notice of a filibuster. I hope the Senator from Michigan did not mean to say that he proposes to read a hundred or a thousand affidavits here, at this time, on the floor of the Senate, in the consideration of this resolution. I frankly say that if the other side of this Chamber are determined that this resolution can not come to a vote at this session they can filibuster it over. We are now within 20 working days of the end of this session. Any four or five able-bodied gentlemen can hold the Senate in session and can tie up all the great supply bills.

Mr. LODGE. We are not tying them up now.

Mr. REED. I will answer that in a moment. If the Senator from Michigan proposes to read a thousand affidavits or a hundred affidavits and proposes to say to us that this question can not come to a vote, he has it in his power to put this matter over.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. HARDWICK. I simply wanted to know if a filibuster was in progress?

Mr. REED. Now?

Mr. HARDWICK. Not now.

Mr. REED. There is one threatened. Did the Senator from Massachusetts want to interrogate me?

Mr. LODGE. I wanted to ask a question, but the Senator has gone away from the point about which I wanted to ask him a question.

Mr. REED. I will come back to it.

Mr. LODGE. I wanted to ask him if those witnesses in New York refused to answer on the ground that they would incriminate themselves?

Mr. REED. Oh, no; I do not think so.

Mr. LODGE. Well, I know that they did not ask it on that ground.

Mr. REED. That is exactly the point. If they had asked it on that ground there would have been some excuse for it.

Mr. LODGE. I do not want to interrupt the Senator, but I think, without any design or desire whatever to filibuster, it would be only fair to give some explanation of that case which the Senator has made appear so very black.

Mr. REED. That is all right. That can be done.

We have had some smiling about filibustering here. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] opened this matter with a statement of the facts, not overlong, and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND] followed with a statement of his views, which was not overlong, and I have taken about the same length of time; and so far as we are concerned upon this side, we are ready to vote. But if the Senators upon the other side tell us that we can not have a vote, that they propose to hold this matter here and filibuster it to death, or discuss it for days, we know that the business of the Senate can not be held in that way, and with a frank statement of that kind we will not press this motion; but we do ask for a vote.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I do not indulge in any camouflage at all about the matter. The Committee on Privileges and Elections once decided that they had no jurisdiction of this matter. Some other matters have come up which have made it absolutely necessary, in my judgment, that this full case be presented to the Senate. It has been presented time and time again by the affidavits of the people who have made charges, and only those people. We have, I think, thousands of affidavits which, if this Senate is going to act, if this Senate is going to proceed with this investigation, it should have.

Mr. REED. But let me ask the Senator a question. Does he refer to affidavits which the Senate should have read here in the Senate or affidavits which it should have presented to the committee that is to investigate the matter?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Affidavits which it should have presented here in the Senate for the purpose of determining whether this committee, or the next committee, shall investigate this question.

Mr. REED. That is to say, affidavits that were made in the State of Michigan?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes, sir.

Mr. REED. As to the facts of this election?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Yes, sir.

Mr. REED. The Senator thinks that those affidavits, being read here in the Senate, will enable the Senate to determine whether it is the present Senate or whether it is the succeeding Senate which should make the investigation?

Mr. TOWNSEND. It will enable the Senate to determine whether or not it wants any investigation at all of this question, and I think they will have to be presented. Now, I do not want to interfere with what I conceive and what the committee has conceived to be the work of the Senate. Anything that you have here that is in order, and ought to be considered, I am ready to consider, and I am ready to lay this aside, so far as I am concerned, for that purpose; but if the majority of the Senate say that they want to take up this question, to the exclusion of the supply bills, if they want to do that, they must know all the facts before they do it.

Mr. REED. But that is not the question, and it can not be put in that way. The majority of the Senate are not going to say that they want to take up this resolution to the exclusion of the supply bills. The proper discussion of this question could certainly be had in a few hours. There may be legal arguments to be made against it; but affidavits, a thousand affidavits, made in Michigan as to the merits of this election can have nothing whatsoever to do with the question as to whether an investigation should be had; and when the Senator says that he proposes to present them to the Senate we know

what he means. We know that he means that he is going to read a thousand affidavits to the Senate, so that the Senate can not pass this resolution unless it does it at the expense of holding up all of the supply bills for this session. In other words, it is the boldest, clearest-cut threat of a filibuster I have ever heard uttered on the floor of the Senate, and I have heard several. Now, just let us understand it.

Mr. President, we ask for a vote; and if the Senator wants to begin reading his affidavits, let him proceed.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have no desire or intention of entering upon any filibuster of any kind. We have sat here in silence and heard all sorts of charges made against Mr. Newberry, whom some of us believe to be an honest man. We know that he has served his country in both wars and that his sons have served his country. Before this matter is decided I shall want to say something. It will not take very long; but I have the same objection to the use of millions of money in elections that the Senator from Missouri has.

Mr. REED. I know it.

Mr. LODGE. I feel about it just as he does. But there is something larger and deeper than even the spending of money in elections, and that is the influence of a colossal fortune like that of Mr. Ford, and the way it has been used, not merely in this election but in all sorts of directions. Before this case is remitted to the Committee on Privileges and Elections those of us who feel quite as strongly about Mr. Ford as you do about Mr. Newberry propose to lay before the country their views on him, and I should like about an hour in which to do it.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator permit me to say, if he misunderstood me, that my remarks about fortunes applied just as much to one of these gentlemen as to the other and just in proportion to their wealth.

Mr. LODGE. When the Senator said that he was an absolutely just judge in this case, I fully agree with him. I believe he would be absolutely just in this case. While he was speaking his remarks reminded me of what was said of a distinguished judge in Massachusetts who resigned from the supreme court, and they said he resigned from the supreme court because he was unable to decide against both parties in every case. [Laughter.] So that I do not question the Senator's justice at all.

Mr. REED. I might be able to do that here.

Mr. LODGE. Possibly; but I do not think it is fair to discuss Mr. Newberry and give an impression about his campaign to the country, here in the Senate, and leave it wholly unanswered and unreplyed to in the same place where the charges have been made, and not behind committee doors.

Mr. BANKHEAD obtained the floor.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator yield for a moment? I was going to suggest to the Senator that perhaps we could agree on voting some time to-morrow.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have not this matter in charge. I am not on the committee, and I am not a Senator from the State of Michigan, and I am not going to undertake to make any arrangements about it. I think it is our duty to go on with the supply bills and not to discuss an election case which comes before the next Senate, over which we have no jurisdiction, as the Senator admits.

Mr. REED. I think we have jurisdiction, absolutely, to take the evidence.

Mr. LODGE. We have jurisdiction to preserve evidence, perhaps.

Mr. REED. I have no doubt about that proposition—that we have jurisdiction.

Mr. LODGE. Between preserving evidence and taking evidence I think there is a distinction.

Mr. REED. Well, taking and preserving are both the same thing.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, may I suggest that I have no objection to a provision which will preserve evidence that is in danger of being lost. We answered every request that was made in the stipulation. We followed out the course that was instituted by Mr. Ford's attorneys. He entered the courts. He ought not to be heard to complain now that they do not have jurisdiction; but we went even further than that. We have placed in their hands the power of the State courts, so that they can go in and preserve every scrap of evidence that they require. Now, if you need anything further than that, I have no objection to its being passed by the Senate; but I do object to going out and taking testimony on an ex parte statement, practically, that has been made to the country from the Senate; and I insist that the facts on both sides shall be presented to the country from this body at the same time.

Mr. REED. If the Senator will pardon me just a moment, the Senator speaks about the decree of the court being the

decree that Mr. Ford wanted. I am not in this case as Mr. Ford's representative. I believe it is the duty of the Senate to find out and preserve the facts. The decree of court, however, as I called attention to when the Senator was out, does not make these ballots secure.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think it does, Mr. President.

Mr. REED. Do I understand the Senator to mean now that he would consent to the passage of the resolution if it was limited merely to the preservation of documentary evidence?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I would. I am perfectly willing that that should be done.

Mr. REED. That is to say that the subcommittee would preserve the ballots and call for and receive and preserve any other documentary evidence?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have no objection to that if that is properly arranged as the stipulation provides. We must know how they are going to be taken and how they are going to do it. I want provision made for doing that.

Mr. REED. You want it done with the attorneys present and a proper representation of the parties.

Mr. TOWNSEND. If the Senator, after reading the law that has passed in Michigan, finds that it covers the ground, so that these people can go into the court there and get all the relief they want, what more does the Senator wish?

Mr. REED. I do not want anything except I want this evidence saved. I do not want it destroyed. I think we are getting to a point where we may be able to agree upon it. Of course, we can not do it very well, standing on the floor of the Senate in this way.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am asking the Senator to read the State law, with the provision that it is given immediate effect, and to see if that does not furnish all the relief which this Congress or Mr. Ford has a right to ask.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 13308) making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, we have had this bill before the Senate for five days, and I think about four and a half hours have been spent in its consideration. I am now going to move to adjourn until to-morrow, but I want to state that beginning to-morrow, after the morning hour, I shall insist that this bill shall be kept before the Senate to-morrow and to-morrow night and the next day and the next night until the bill is passed.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have been waiting to hear a statement like that for some time. I hope the Senator will do as he states, and I hope that those having charge of other bills that we must dispose of before Congress adjourns will insist upon a similar proceeding.

THE REVENUE.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, with a view to facilitating action upon the revenue bill when it is reported to the Senate, I wish to state to the Senate that there will be a conference report filed in the House, and that the bill as amended by the conferees has been printed. These documents can be had by applying at the Document Room.

As a further aid to Senators in getting ready so that we can dispose of the report without delay, I am going to ask that the conference report be printed in the Record in order that those Senators who desire to do so may examine it in advance of its regular presentation to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBINSON in the chair). The Chair suggests to the Senator from North Carolina that the conference report will be printed in the House proceedings of to-day, and that it would not be competent for the Senate to make an order for printing the report in advance of receiving the report.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Chair did not understand me. I am not proposing to present the report of the conferees on the part of the Senate. I am simply asking that the report which has been made to the House by the House conferees be printed in the Record.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask the Senator if, when the report is presented to the House, it will not be printed in the Record?

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not think so, but I am not quite sure about that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from North Carolina to request that if the conference report does not appear in the proceedings of the House when presented to the House the same shall be printed in the Record of the proceedings of the Senate.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is what I request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave will be granted. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to ask the Senator in what form the matter is going to appear, so that the public at large may know what the bill itself provides for in its entirety.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have stated that the bill as amended by the conferees has been printed. It is already printed, so that with the report of the conferees any Senator can tell exactly what has been done.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 7, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 6, 1919.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Oh Thou, to whom we are indebted for all things, God our Heavenly Father, without whom we are nothing, illumine our minds, quicken our conscience, that we may see clearly the way and act fearlessly, nobly, our part in the great drama of life, under the spiritual leadership of Thy son Jesus Christ, the world's Great Exemplar; and Thine be the glory forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

UNEMPLOYMENT OF MINE WORKERS.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a letter and a resolution passed by the United Mine Workers of America. I want to say that in Ohio alone there are 15,000 mine workers who have not worked a day this year and the other 30,000 have worked only about 50 per cent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to incorporate in the RECORD a letter and resolution. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERWOOD. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has this lack of employment or the small number employed in the output of coal been the result of the action of the mine owners so as to keep up the high price of coal, or what has been the purpose?

Mr. SHERWOOD. I will have the resolution read, if the gentleman desires.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought the gentleman had the information as to the reason why these men are out of employment, when the price of coal is three times what it was in peace times.

Mr. SHERWOOD. There is nothing in the resolution about that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter and resolution are as follows:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Columbus, Ohio, January 30, 1919.

HON. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We have just made a tour of the coal-mining districts of Ohio and find conditions extremely bad.

There are 15,000 coal miners in this State that have not worked one day this year, the other 30,000 have worked less than 50 per cent time and have no assurance of any immediate relief.

The people living in the mining communities have lost all confidence in themselves and everyone else, including the Government, and because of this lack of confidence people are only buying what they absolutely can not get along without.

Because of this, the merchants are buying nothing from the wholesale houses and everyone is affected all along the line.

There is only one remedy that we can see at this time that will bring relief and restore confidence and that is for the Government to inform all operators and coal consumers that the price fixed by the President in 1917 would maintain in 1919, and that fuel purchased by the Railroad Administration would take the same price as other consumers are required to pay and that all coal purchased by the Railroad Administration for fuel purpose or Government use should be as near equally distributed among all the mines as is possible, thus assuring to the men employed in and around the mines an equal opportunity to earn a dollar during this reconstructive period.

I appeal to you as a citizen and statesman from this grand old Buckeye State to use your power in Congress and with the Fuel and Railroad Administration to the end that a public statement will emanate from Washington to the effect that the price of coal fixed by the President would maintain during this year.

The effect of an order of this kind will bring immediate relief, because large consumers are not purchasing coal at this time because they have coal in stock and are using their stock in the belief that prices will be reduced.

If they had the assurance that prices will not be reduced, instead of consuming their stock coal, they would from time to time purchase part of their daily consumption so that will, to that extent, increase production and increase the earnings of the men employed in and around the mines.

You will kindly give this question the serious consideration that it merits and advise us of any information or relief that you may be able to secure.

Thanking you in advance for giving this matter your personal attention, we beg to remain,
Sincerely,

JOHN MOORE,
President Ohio Miners.
G. W. SAVAGE,
Secretary-Treasurer Ohio Miners.

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Columbus, Ohio, January 31, 1919.

HON. ISAAC R. SHERWOOD,
Member United States Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The following resolution was unanimously adopted by the delegates representing fifty thousand (50,000) coal miners in the thirtieth annual convention of Ohio miners, District No. 6, United Mine Workers of America.

Trusting you will give this matter your early consideration, I am,
Respectfully,

G. W. SAVAGE,
Secretary.

Resolution.

To the representatives of the Ohio Mine Workers, thirtieth annual convention assembled:

Whereas the Government agents representing the Railroad Administration are using every effort possible to reduce the price of railroad coal per ton to less than the price set by the President of the United States, Hon. Woodrow Wilson, for the duration of the war; and Whereas during reconstruction period, in order to prevent disaster in our industrial affairs, it is absolutely necessary to have all industries in our country operate to provide employment for those who must work for a living; and

Whereas if the policy of reducing the price of railroad coal is adopted, it will cause many of the mines to close down and throw thousands of our miners out of employment, which would cause hardships among the miners and their families; Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, representing approximately fifty thousand (50,000) mine workers in Ohio, want an equal division of the work, and who, because of the enormous high cost of living, appeal to the authorities at Washington and our Government to insist that the price per ton for coal for railroad fuel be the same as the price made by the Government, and which every other consumer is required to pay; and be it further

Resolved, That as a solution to prevent the closing of some of the mines, while others are in operation, the miners demand that each mine in operation be given the opportunity to supply coal for railroad fuel, and that the tonnage be divided among the various mines in proportion to the tonnage produced; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary be instructed to send copy of this resolution to Members of United States Congress from Ohio, to Hon. Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States; Hon. Walker D. Hines, Director General of Railroad Administration; Hon. H. A. Garfield, Fuel Administrator; Hon. Felix Frankfurter, War Labor Policy Board; Hon. W. B. Wilson, Secretary of Labor; and Hon. Ellison D. Smith, chairman, Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 5342. An act providing for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern judicial district of the State of Texas.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1847) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Wyoming National Forest.

THE REVENUE.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report on the revenue bill, H. R. 12863, and ask that it be printed under the rule.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman presents a conference report on the revenue bill, which will be printed in the RECORD under the rule.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. MANN. Is it proposed to have the revenue bill printed in any way, as it will read if the conference report is agreed to?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Either before or after the conference report is agreed upon?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. We have the bill already printed as agreed upon by the conferees, and any Member of the House can send over to the room of the Committee on Ways and Means in the House Office Building and get a copy to-day. Of course, copies will be printed to-morrow and be in the document room, but Members can get copies to-day by sending over to the room of the committee.

Mr. MANN. The committee have had it printed for the use of the committee, but it would not be printed for the document room, would it?

Mr. KITCHIN. Not until to-morrow.

Mr. MANN. It would not be printed for the document room at all unless there was a special order made.

Mr. KITCHIN. I forgot to say that I have a motion with reference to that which I am going to present immediately.

Mr. MANN. If the conference report is agreed to, of course the bill will be signed eventually by the President; but I apprehend that it will not be practicable for the President to sign the bill probably until he returns home.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MANN. It seems to me it will be very important to assume that the President will sign the bill if the conference report is agreed to, and that meanwhile people ought to know what it is going to be, so they can begin to prepare to make their returns.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will tell the gentleman our intention. I have an order reading this way:

Ordered. That there be printed for the use of the House document room 2,500 copies of the bill (H. R. 12863) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, agreed to in conference.

I will offer that in a moment. Then, after the conference report is agreed to by the House and the Senate I will try to get an order to print it in pamphlet form, so that it can be sent out to the people, and the House and Senate can have the privilege of getting copies. Of course, it will be unsigned, but it will be exactly as the bill passed.

Mr. MANN. When does the gentleman intend to call up the conference report?

Mr. KITCHIN. Saturday.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I have just come in. Has the conference report been agreed upon?

Mr. KITCHIN. It has been agreed to by the conferees. I have just presented it for printing in the RECORD. Any gentleman can get a copy of the report as agreed upon and the statement of the conferees on the part of the House by sending to the Committee on Ways and Means in the House Office Building at any time to-day.

Mr. Speaker, I present the motion which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ordered. That there be printed for the use of the House document room 2,500 copies of the bill H. R. 12863, an act to provide revenue, and for other purposes, agreed to in conference.

The motion was agreed to.

CASUALTIES IN THE PENNSYLVANIA NATIONAL GUARD.

Mr. VARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a newspaper article concerning the casualties in the Pennsylvania National Guard.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a newspaper article.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not understand what it is about.

Mr. VARE. It is an article from the Philadelphia Press, which gives the casualties of the members of the National Guard of Pennsylvania.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the gentleman think we ought to commence to print the casualty lists in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

Mr. VARE. This makes some comparisons which show the very important part taken by Pennsylvania troops.

Mr. FOSTER. All the States have had a good many casualties, and if we begin printing these lists every State ought to have the right to do the same thing, it seems to me.

Mr. VARE. I have yet to see the time on this floor when there was objection made to printing anything calling attention to the important part that any gentleman's State may have played in the war.

Mr. FOSTER. I know that all the States have played an important part, and we are all proud of them.

Mr. VARE. I do not doubt that a bit.

Mr. FOSTER. But I do not believe we ought to publish these lists in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MANN. I do not understand this is a proposition to publish the casualty lists.

Mr. FOSTER. That is what I understood.

Mr. VARE. Not the names of individuals. This is simply a newspaper article—

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, I misunderstood the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, is it the object to show by comparison that Pennsylvania had a larger casualty list than organizations in other States?

Mr. VARE. No. It does not make a comparison with the rest of the States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, how long an article is it? Is it all that the gentleman has in his hand?

Mr. VARE. No; it is a part of it.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is a small part. I have not objection to that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WOUNDED MARINES AT CHELSEA HOSPITAL, MASS.

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, there have been some erroneous reports published in reference to the payment of wounded Marines at the Chelsea Hospital, near Boston. I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD some official correspondence and reports relating to the matter.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD some official correspondence and reports in regard to wounded marines in the Chelsea Hospital, near Boston. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, how long is the correspondence?

Mr. OLIVER of Alabama. It is short, it will not take, I think, over a page of the RECORD, embracing official correspondence and reports relating to the matter in question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The correspondence and reports are as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1919.

Gen. GEORGE RICHARDS, United States Marine Corps,
Washington.

MY DEAR GEN. RICHARDS: My attention has been called to a report, appearing recently in the New York World, to the effect that 25 United States Marines have been without any pay for about eight months. A letter was written on this subject by Senator LODGE to Gen. Lauchheimer, which letter with the reply thereto was submitted to the House Naval Affairs Committee.

I understand that later you made a thorough investigation of this report, and I would appreciate your sending me copies of the correspondence between Senator LODGE and Gen. Lauchheimer, and any reports that you may have submitted in connection therewith. I learn that recently this erroneous report has been circulated among some of the Members of Congress, and for this reason think that it should be corrected by setting out the facts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Yours, sincerely,

W. B. OLIVER.

HEADQUARTERS U. S. MARINE CORPS,
PAYMASTER'S DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., February 6, 1919.

MY DEAR MR. OLIVER: Replying to your letter of even date relative to a report printed in the New York Evening World, to the effect that there were a number of wounded marines in the naval hospital, Chelsea, Mass., who had received no pay for eight months or more, this office would state that this report as to these wounded being without pay, it appears, was first published in New England newspapers some time in November last, as brought to attention here by Senator LODGE of Massachusetts. If you will refer to the printed hearing of the Marine Corps, before the Naval Committee of the House December 19, 1918, you will see there certain correspondence between Senator LODGE and Gen. Lauchheimer on this subject; copies in full are inclosed herewith, from which it will be seen that the statement that these men had received no pay was found to be untrue.

Later the same report was republished in the New York Evening World of December 27, 1918, in connection with a notice that a benefit ball, to occur at the Cambridge Armory on New Year's eve, was being arranged for by public-spirited citizens to supply these wounded marines with funds to purchase needed comforts. Again this matter was reinvestigated at the direction of these headquarters. You will find inclosed a copy of the report made by this office on January 9, 1919. You will see in examining this paper that it was found as a result of that reinvestigation that not a single one of these wounded marines in the naval hospital at Chelsea who wished their pay failed to receive pay immediately after their admission to that hospital.

Trusting that this information is sufficient for your purposes and thanking you for this evidence of your interest in the welfare of the enlisted force of the Marine Corps, believe me to be, with kindest regards,

Faithfully, yours,

GEORGE RICHARDS,
Brigadier General,
The Paymaster, United States Marine Corps.

HON. WILLIAM B. OLIVER,
Washington, D. C.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE OF PRIVATE LAND CLAIMS,
November 9, 1918.

MY DEAR GEN. LAUCHHEIMER: I should be very much indebted if you would let me know whether there is foundation for a report which has come to me that a number of our marines who were wounded in France and are now undergoing treatment at the naval hospital at Chelsea, Mass., have received no pay from the Government for many months and are unable to obtain any. I do not know the names of these soldiers at Chelsea, but a constituent of mine has written me in their behalf, sending me a statement from one of the Boston newspapers in regard to the matter. For any information that you may give me I shall be greatly obliged.

Very truly, yours,

H. C. LODGE.

Brig. Gen. C. H. LAUCHHEIMER,
The Adjutant General, United States Marine Corps.

HEADQUARTERS MARINE CORPS,
November 11, 1918.

NAVY YARD, BOSTON, MASS.

For marine barracks: Investigate and report immediately if any wounded marines in naval hospital, Chelsea, have received no pay for many months and are unable to obtain pay period. Attention is called to instructions August 17 covering subject payment wounded marines, also to more specific orders October 8, requiring detailed reports covering cases of wounded marines unpaid for many months.

MARCORPS.

NOVEMBER 12, 1918.

MY DEAR SENATOR LODGE: Your letter of the 9th instant, bringing to my attention report that there are a number of wounded marines at the naval hospital, Chelsea, Mass., who have received no pay for several months and are unable to obtain any, has been received. This matter has been taken up by wire with the commanding officer Marine Barracks, navy yard, Boston, Mass., that the precise facts may be developed, action taken, and proper information supplied you.

As to whether there is any foundation for the report, let me say that we already know that the commanding officers of some of the units of the Marine Corps in France, did, in April last, suspend regular payments to their commands for reasons of a military nature; also, that later, when some of those units went under fire, the wounded men were evacuated through the British and French evacuation and base hospitals, situated in something more than 75 widely scattered localities.

Immediately the officers of the Paymaster's Department, Marine Corps, in France, made every effort to reach our wounded who needed funds; there are two letters inclosed herewith, as well as an official report of the Paymaster, Marine Corps, that cover details. In addition, Col. John H. Hughes, Inspector General, United States Army, in France, reports under date of September 6, 1918, the following:

"Paragraph 3, page 7, General Order 111, General Headquarters American Expeditionary Forces, 1918, requires that in case marines are sent to hospital their service records be sent direct to paymaster, United States Marine Corps, Paris. There are now about 6,000 of these service records in this office. All men away from organizations are supposed to have their records at the Paris office. There are men whose records have been lost, and in some cases records are said to have been destroyed by shell fire. In such cases these men are paid from data available on cards in Paris office. The duplicate service record must be secured from the United States. Maj. Willis has made during August a round of all hospitals west of a line north and south through Paris and paid each man 100 francs. At the same time he left cards with the men by which they can inform him of any change of address. He paid about 1,300 men. He left Paris about September 3 to make a similar trip through eastern France, and on his return will have much valuable data as to the whereabouts of the men to be paid from his office. On future trips it is the intention to pay men full amount due them. It is impracticable to take these trips by railroad due to the great loss of time in getting from place to place and the short stay at each place."

When some of these wounded began arriving within the United States general instructions were issued August 17, 1918, to all posts of the Marine Corps on the eastern coast, so that the needs of these men, in the matter of funds, might further be met, and in connection therewith specific reports were required to be furnished these headquarters covering such cases as you describe.

In these circumstances your inquiry may now only be answered to the effect that no reports have been received here as to any such cases in the naval hospital at Chelsea, Mass., and in the absence of such reports the rumor is probably incorrect. As indicated above, you will be informed as to the result of our investigation. In the meantime let me express my appreciation to you for bringing the matter so promptly to our attention.

With kindest regards, believe me to be,
Faithfully, yours,

C. H. LAUCHHEIMER.

Senator H. C. LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON PRIVATE LAND CLAIMS,
November 12, 1918.

MY DEAR GEN. LAUCHHEIMER: I am very much obliged for your letter of the 12th and for the information which you give me. I knew, of course, that everything possible was being done by the Marine Corps to extend financial aid to our wounded marines, but I was anxious to ascertain from you just what was being done in that direction in order that I might make intelligent reply to those who have written me about it.

With kind regards and many thanks, I am,
Very truly, yours,

H. C. LODGE.

Brig. Gen. C. H. LAUCHHEIMER,
Headquarters United States Marine Corps, Washington, D. C.

NOVEMBER 14, 1918.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In further reference to our previous correspondence with regard to wounded marines not receiving their pay, I have the honor to quote for your information the following telegram which has just been received from the commanding officer marine barracks, Boston, in reply to telegraphic orders which were sent to him on the 11th instant to investigate this matter:

"All wounded marines at Chelsea (Boston) hospital have been able to draw pay when desired, except Pvt. Leroy Barbee, who returned Monday from sick leave. Status of his pay accounts was forwarded Tuesday to assistant paymaster, 291 Broadway (New York), and he should receive payment by to-morrow. Barbee was last paid to and including 31st May."

You will note from this that we are taking all possible steps to see that wounded marines returned to this country do not have their pay held up, and if any such cases have occurred they are exceptional cases, which we are endeavoring to guard against.

Again expressing my appreciation of your interest in the welfare of our men, and with the assurance of my high regard, believe me,
Sincerely, yours,

C. H. LAUCHHEIMER,
Brigadier General, Adjutant, and Inspector.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

JANUARY 9, 1919.

From: The Paymaster.
To: The Major General Commandant.
Subject: Personal letter from Brig. Gen. C. S. Radford, assistant quartermaster, Marine Corps, to Brig. Gen. C. H. Lauchheimer, inclosing clippings from newspapers in re alleged nonpayment of wounded marines.

1. Pursuant to reference (a), this office got in communication with the assistant paymaster at New York, by telephone, and directed him to

make an investigation and submit report relative to nonreceipt of pay by wounded marines. This was on December 31, 1918. The assistant paymaster at New York on that date informed this office that so far as known to him all men in the naval hospital at Chelsea who desired funds had been paid. The same date this office had a telephonic communication with the commanding officer, marine barracks, Boston, Mass., and was advised by him that the statement contained in the clipping from the Evening World was untrue.

2. In addition to the foregoing, a telegram was prepared for the major general commandant addressed to the commanding officer, marine barracks, Boston, which read as follows:

"Referring to article in New York Evening World headed 'Eight months unpaid but don't whimper,' and dated Boston, December 27, regarding benefit ball to raise funds for 25 marines in Chelsea hospital. Investigate and report immediately to the major general commandant all the facts in detail with a list of the names of wounded marines in the Chelsea hospital with dates and amount of last payment, and if not paid since arrival the reason for nonpayment. Attention is again called to instructions August 17 and October 8 requiring payments and detailed reports covering cases of this kind."

3. Under date of January 2, 1919, this office received a report on this subject from the assistant paymaster, New York, N. Y., dated December 31, which is quoted for your information, as follows:

"Subject: Payment of wounded marines in United States Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass.

"1. In connection with references (a) and (b), there is transmitted herewith a list showing the names of all men to whom this office has any knowledge as being patients at the United States Naval Hospital, Chelsea, Mass. This list has been prepared from the pay roll of the Marine Barracks, Boston, Mass., for the month of November, 1918.

"2. This office notes that no emergency payment has been made in the cases of Pvt. George H. Tower and Sergt. Arthur Cliff. No request from the commanding officer of the Boston barracks has been received in this office requesting an advance.

"3. Reference (c) will explain the reason no advance has been made to Daum.

"R. E. DAVIS."

4. The report from the commanding officer marine barracks, navy yard, Boston, Mass., reference (d) on this case, the original of which is attached hereto as well as the report from the assistant paymaster, Marine Corps, New York, quoted herein, shows that statements contained in the clipping from the New York Evening World, referred to in this correspondence, were without foundation in fact. Particular attention is invited to the following paragraph from the report of the commanding officer Marine Barracks, Boston, Mass.:

"3. With reference to the benefit ball, a Mr. George Baker, an employee of the Washburn-Crosby flour agency at Boston, came to see me about two weeks ago with reference to this ball. Mr. Baker stated that he has for many years been a firm friend of the Marine Corps. Nevertheless, I declined to accede to Mr. Baker's request for permission to use my name in connection with the proposed ball, or to take action which would give the ball an official status; and without hurting Mr. Baker's feelings, in view of his expressed friendly sentiments, I endeavored to discourage the project of a benefit ball, as I felt that an erroneous impression might be created. I also informed Mr. Baker that the wounded marines in Chelsea Hospital were being well looked out for financially and in all respects, under special orders from the major general commandant."

The fourth paragraph of the report of the commanding officer Marine Barracks, Boston, Mass., reading as follows, is further evidence of the absolute untruth of the contents of the clipping from the New York Evening World:

"4. The instructions of 17 August and 8 October, 1918, referred to in reference (a) have been carefully complied with by this office. Almost daily inquiry has been made at the Chelsea Hospital in order that every case might receive careful and prompt attention."

In this connection special attention is invited to the fact that the commanding officer at Marine Barracks, Boston, Mass., has been making almost daily inquiry at the Chelsea Hospital, evidencing that that commanding officer has taken a very active interest in the matter of looking after the wants and needs of all wounded marines in that hospital.

5. This final report in this case was held here awaiting the receipt in this office of the report from the commanding officer Marine Barracks, navy yard, Boston, Mass., reference (d), which appears to have been received at these headquarters on January 3, 1919, but was not received in this office until January 8, 1919, five days later.

GEORGE RICHARDS.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. HARRISON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia makes the point that no quorum is present. Evidently there is not. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 265, nays 0, answered "present" 2, not voting 162, as follows:

YEAS—265.

Alexander	Bankhead	Blackmon	Brodbeck
Almon	Barkley	Bland, Ind.	Browning
Ashbrook	Barnhart	Bland, Va.	Buchanan
Aswell	Beakes	Blanton	Burroughs
Ayres	Bell	Bowers	Butler
Bacharach	Beshlin	Brand	Byrnes, S. C.
Baer	Black	Britten	Caldwell

Campbell, Kans.	Garner	Lobeck	Rucker
Campbell, Pa.	Garrett, Tenn.	Loneragan	Sabath
Cannon	Garrett, Tex.	Longworth	Sanders, Ind.
Carter, Mass.	Glynn	Lufkin	Saunders, Va.
Carter, Okla.	Good	McArthur	Scott, Iowa
Cary	Goodwin, Ark.	McClintic	Scott, Mich.
Chandler, N. Y.	Graham, Ill.	McCormick	Sells
Chandler, Okla.	Gray, Ala.	McCulloch	Sherwood
Clark, Pa.	Green, Iowa	McKeown	Shouse
Classon	Gregg	McKinley	Siegel
Claypool	Griest	McLaughlin, Mich.	Sinnott
Cleary	Hadley	McLaughlin, Pa.	Sisson
Connally, Tex.	Hamlin	McLemore	Slemp
Connelly, Kans.	Hardy	Magee	Sloan
Cooper, Ohio	Harrison, Va.	Maher	Smith, C. B.
Cooper, W. Va.	Haskell	Mann	Smith, T. F.
Cooper, Wis.	Hayden	Mansfield	Snook
Copley	Hayes	Mapes	Snyder
Crisp	Heflin	Martin	Stafford
Currie, Mich.	Hensley	Mason	Stedman
Dale	Hersey	Mays	Steenerson
Dallinger	Hicks	Merritt	Stephens, Miss.
Darrow	Holland	Miller, Minn.	Stevenson
Dempsey	Hollingsworth	Miller, Wash.	Strong
Denison	Hood	Montague	Summers
Denton	Houston	Moon	Tagne
Dies	Huddleston	Moore, Pa.	Taylor, Colo.
Dill	Hull, Tenn.	Moore, Ind.	Temple
Dillon	Humphreys	Morgan	Tillman
Dixon	Husted	Mott	Tilson
Dominick	Igoe	Mudd	Timberlake
Doughton	Ireland	Neely	Tinkham
Dowell	Jacoway	Nelson, A. P.	Towner
Dunn	James	Nicholls, S. C.	Treadway
Dupré	Johnson, Wash.	Oldfield	Vare
Dyer	Jones	Oliver, Ala.	Venable
Ellsworth	Juul	Oliver, N. Y.	Vestal
Elston	Kearns	O'Shaunessy	Vinson
Evans	Keating	Overstreet	Volgt
Fairchild, B. L.	Kehoe	Padgett	Volstead
Fairchild, G. W.	Kelley, Mich.	Parker, N. J.	Walsh
Fairfield	Kennedy, R. I.	Parker, N. Y.	Walton
Farr	Kettner	Peters	Wason
Ferris	Kless, Pa.	Phelan	Watkins
Fess	Kincheloe	Platt	Watson, Pa.
Flood	King	Polk	Watson, Va.
Fordney	Kinkaid	Porter	Weaver
Foss	Kitchin	Purnell	Welling
Foster	Knutson	Quin	Welty
Francis	Kraus	Ragsdale	Wheeler
Frear	La Folette	Raker	White, Me.
Freeman	LaGuardia	Ramseyer	Wilson, La.
French	Lampert	Randall	Wilson, Tex.
Fuller, Ill.	Langley	Reed	Wingo
Fuller, Mass.	Larsen	Riordan	Wood, Ind.
Gallagher	Lazaro	Rodenberg	Wright
Gallivan	Lea, Cal.	Rogers	Zihlman
Gandy	Lehlbach	Romjue	
Gard	Linthicum	Rouse	
Garland	Little	Rowe	

ANSWERED "PRESENT."—2.

Emerson London

NOT VOTING—162.

Anderson	Edmonds	Lee, Ga.	Scully
Anthony	Elliott	Leshner	Sears
Austin	Esch	Lever	Shackelford
Benson	Essen	Littlepage	Shallenberger
Birch	Estopinal	Lundeen	Sherley
Booher	Fields	Lunn	Sims
Borland	Fisher	McAndrews	Slayden
Browne	Flynn	McFadden	Small
Brumbaugh	Focht	McKenzie	Smith, Idaho
Burnett	Gillett	Madden	Smith, Mich.
Byrns, Tenn.	Godwin, N. C.	Mondell	Snell
Candler, Miss.	Goodall	Morin	Steagall
Cantrill	Gordon	Nelson, J. M.	Steele
Caraway	Gould	Nichols, Mich.	Stephens, Nebr.
Carew	Graham, Pa.	Nolan	Sterling
Carlin	Gray, N. J.	Norton	Stiness
Church	Greene, Mass.	Olney	Sullivan
Clark, Fla.	Greene, Vt.	Osborne	Sweet
Coady	Grimm	Overmyer	Swift
Collier	Hamill	Paige	Switzer
Costello	Hamilton, Mich.	Park	Taylor, Ark.
Cox	Hamilton, N. Y.	Pou	Templeton
Crago	Harrison, Miss.	Powers	Thomas
Cramton	Hastings	Pratt	Thompson
Crosser	Haugen	Price	Van Dyke
Curry, Cal.	Hawley	Rainey, H. T.	Waldow
Davey	Heaton	Rainey, J. W.	Walker
Davis	Heintz	Ramsey	Ward
Decker	Helm	Rankin	Webb
Delaney	Helvering	Rayburn	Whaley
Dent	Hilliard	Reavis	White, Ohio
Dewalt	Howard	Roberts	Williams
Dickinson	Hull, Iowa	Robinson	Wilson, Ill.
Donovan	Hutchinson	Rose	Winslow
Dooling	Hutchinson, Ky.	Rowland	Wise
Doolittle	Johnson, S. Dak.	Rubey	Woods, Iowa
Doremus	Kahn	Russell	Woodyard
Drane	Kelly, Pa.	Sanders, La.	Young, N. Dak.
Drukker	Kennedy, Iowa	Sanders, N. Y.	Young, Tex.
Eagan	Key, Ohio	Sanford	
Eagle	Kreider	Schall	

So the motion of Mr. PADGETT was agreed to.

The following pairs were announced:

Until further notice:

Mr. CLARK of Florida with Mr. EDMONDS.

Mr. HENRY T. RAINY with Mr. WILSON of Illinois.

Mr. SLAYDEN with Mr. SWEETZER.

Mr. SEARS with Mr. NOLAN.
 Mr. BOOHER with Mr. HAMILTON of Michigan.
 Mr. LEVER with Mr. HAUGEN.
 Mr. CAREW with Mr. GOODALL.
 Mr. ESTOPINAL with Mr. EMERSON.
 Mr. WHITE of Ohio with Mr. NORTON.
 Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi with Mr. REAVIS.
 Mr. HAMILL with Mr. KREIDER.
 Mr. BRUMBAUGH with Mr. COSTELLO.
 Mr. CANDLEY of Mississippi with Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma.
 Mr. BENSON with Mr. ANDERSON.
 Mr. LITTLEPAGE with Mr. AUSTIN.
 Mr. CARAWAY with Mr. BROWNE.
 Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee with Mr. DAVIS.
 Mr. DENT with Mr. KAHN.
 Mr. DONOVAN with Mr. FOCHT.
 Mr. DOOLING with Mr. GOULD.
 Mr. CANTRILL with Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa.
 Mr. HELM with Mr. HUTCHINSON.
 Mr. HELVERING with Mr. KNUTSON.
 Mr. SUMMERS with Mr. MCFADDEN.
 Mr. McANDREWS with Mr. MCKENZIE.
 Mr. OLNEY with Mr. MADDEN.
 Mr. OVERMYER with Mr. OSBORNE.
 Mr. PARK with Mr. PAIGE.
 Mr. POE with Mr. RAMSEY.
 Mr. PRICE with Mr. SANDERS of New York.
 Mr. RUSSELL with Mr. SANFORD.
 Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana with Mr. SMITH of Idaho.
 Mr. SCULLY with Mr. SNELL.
 Mr. SIMS with Mr. ESCH.
 Mr. SMALL with Mr. GILLET.
 Mr. STERLING with Mr. WILLIAMS.
 Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas with Mr. WINSLOW.
 Mr. WEBB with Mr. WOODYARD.
 Mr. COADY with Mr. GREENE of Vermont.
 Mr. COLLIER with Mr. MONDELL.
 Mr. BURNETT with Mr. STINESS.
 Mr. THOMAS with Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
 Mr. WHALEY with Mr. HAWLEY.
 Mr. DELANEY with Mr. CRAGO.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, before we proceed I desire to make a statement. About one hour and a few minutes remain of general debate. It is our desire to finish this bill by to-morrow night, and for that purpose, if it is necessary, I shall ask the House to sit to-night. I hope it will not be necessary. I hope that we can make such progress during the day that it will not be necessary. If it should be necessary to have a night session in order to complete the bill by to-morrow night, however, I shall ask that that procedure be pursued. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KIRCHIN] gave notice this morning that he would call up on Saturday the conference report upon the revenue bill, and we desire to have this bill out of the way by that time.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as I have to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS], and, as I understand it, the chairman of the committee has agreed to yield to him part of his time.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I yield to the gentleman 20 minutes of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for 25 minutes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman: The forces of liberty, right, and justice, in a contest in which civilization was at stake, achieved a great triumph in the world war, now happily concluded. To that high enterprise our country made a notable contribution. Imperial Germany is prostrate, Austria is in the dust, Turkey is a shapeless ruin, great Russia is a formless mass of jarring and discordant elements. Thrones, principalities, and potentates have been overthrown. Nowhere do the powers of autocracy rear their insolent heads to threaten the peace of the world. Nowhere may be seen the menace of any danger to the United States. Having these conditions in mind we are moved to ask why it is, that at this time the most prodigious naval bill in the history of our country, has been reported to this body, and why in face of the admitted facts Congress should approve the recommendations of the Naval Committee? Is it the logic of the situation that as dangers recede, our preparations for war shall multiply? Is it true that in proportion to the declining power of the arrogant autocracies that aspired to the overlordship of the world, this mighty, free, and secure Republic of ours must multiply the agencies of

destruction under the pretense that they are required for necessary defense?

A few days ago there came to us news of the most tremendous significance that was ever borne to the expectant peoples of the earth, since this old world of our started spinning down the ringing grooves of change. That news was to the effect that the congress at Paris had agreed upon a league of nations, and that the terms of the agreement provided for the disarmament of the nations, the reduction of military forces, and the abolition of conscription for the maintenance of armies—in a word, for the destruction of those agencies which throughout the ages have agitated, perturbed, and filled with dire alarms the free and liberty-loving peoples of the earth. If that news be true, then certainly there is no necessity for the action recommended to be taken, and if it be not true, then I will ask some spokesman for this bill, to tell me and to tell this committee what are the dangers against which we are asked to prepare, who are the possible enemies likely to confront us, and why it is that in addition to the inevitable burdens entailed by the great war, we are now asked to assume burdens in the way of a larger Army and a larger Navy, far greater than were deemed necessary for the national defense in the period that preceded our declaration of war? Emerging as victors from a short but bloody participation in a war that has served to make the world secure for the citizens of this Republic, have we only succeeded in laying greater military and naval burdens on our country? Does it fairly follow from our victory, that the dangers to the peace and security of the United States have been so greatly magnified, that upon a calm review of the world situation we are justified in concluding that we must increase both our Army, and our Navy to the dimensions proposed, to adequately safeguard our national interests? If we look for information on this material inquiry, to the report of the Naval Committee, what do we find? Not a word in the way of explanation, or justification of its recommendations.

After giving a number of details related to the great expenditures proposed, the report contents itself with saying that it is agreed that we need an adequate Navy—a magnificent platitude but hardly an illuminating statement. Whatever may be our divergent views as to the size of the Navy, we are all agreed that we favor an adequate Navy. But this body of intelligent representatives of the American people is justified in asking the Naval Committee to advise us as to the dangers which it deems are reasonably to be apprehended, and the impelling reasons for the policy which it recommends? May I ask, what is an adequate Navy? Is the answer, a sufficient Navy? If so may I ask, what is a sufficient Navy? Unless we are apprised of the dangers reasonably to be apprehended, how can we determine the size of the Navy required to repel those dangers? A few days ago one of our admirals testified before the Committee on Naval Affairs. His testimony appears in the hearings. He testified somewhat after this fashion, that whatever may be the extent of our naval construction, it will not be equal to the Navy needs. Further, that now is the appropriate time for this country to make the suggested enhancements and enlargements, because the world expects us to take this action. And still further, that there never has been any period in the history of the United States when our country needed greater naval preparation than at this good hour. There are three statements of fact involved in this testimony that every man on this floor, I believe, will instantly challenge.

The cryptic and mysterious utterances that come from time to time from members of the high command, serve only to agitate, confuse, and alarm the public mind. For the purposes of intelligent action, we would like to have some definite recital of facts to support the statements made by this witness, some definite information afforded from which the Congress can determine what ought to be done with respect to any emergency likely to arise. [Applause.] I ask the Members on both sides of the Chamber, intelligent and patriotic representatives of the people who have shown throughout the dread emergency that has confronted the country during the last two years, that there was nothing that you were not prepared to do in support of the public cause—I ask you, my colleagues, in view of that proud and ineffaceable record of public achievement, if you are not entitled to be told by your Naval Committee why it is, that at this time when our enemies are prostrate, we should increase the public burdens in the name of national defense? What are the dangers that render necessary these prodigious preparations? [Applause.]

When the admiral referred to, stated that the world expected us at this time to increase our Military and Naval Establishment, upon what did he base that statement? Are we not entitled to know? If we look abroad to ascertain the facts required for intelligent action as representatives of the people, what do we find?

England has deferred her naval program. Neither in France, Italy, or Spain, do we find any lurking dangers, or any quickening activities that would cause anyone to conclude that this country is so seriously endangered that our Navy must be enlarged, and our standing Army increased. Germany is in sackcloth and ashes. Look to Japan, China, South America, take in the whole circle of the world, and tell me where you find the evidence of any present, or prospective preparation so extensive, and so alarming, as to make it necessary for this Congress to proceed with feverish haste to establish new armaments in the name of proper and adequate defense. The other governments of the world are anxiously striving to bring about a reduction of the burdens entailed by the war. The heaviest of these burdens are their overgrown military and naval establishments. Why should those nations which are all agreed that armaments must be reduced, expect us at this time to multiply our burdens, to establish larger armies, and more powerful navies, unless our country is in greater danger, than in the ante-bellum period? It is not enough for this admiral to make the statements that he did as a witness before the Naval Committee. He should communicate to that committee, and they in turn to us, the facts upon which he based that statement. Again he declares that at no time in our history has there been as great need for preparation as at present. Against what menace is this proposed preparation, this supplementary naval program intended to protect us? Is it some alleged danger? Then what danger? In what quarter is it reasonably to be apprehended?

What nation threatens us with naval activities likely to put in jeopardy a single right, or a single interest of the American people? Where are those activities to be found? A few days ago the Scientific American—and surely no one will take that journal as erring on the side of what is called little navyism—stated in a leading editorial that to-day in dreadnaught power this country is equal to that of any three nations in the world, excepting England. The modern dreadnaught strength of the United States as stated by that journal and nowhere denied, is equal to that of Japan, France, and Italy combined. This being so, where then is the danger reasonably likely to arise, and sufficient in extent, to justify this Congress in hastily authorizing the gigantic supplementary program proposed by this bill? The naval program of 1916 was the most prodigious ever adopted in any country at any time. Construction under this program has hardly begun. Our present dreadnaught strength, including three dreadnaughts practically, though not actually complete, is 19 great battleships. The three nations I have recited, Japan, France, and Italy, have 21 modern dreadnaughts.

The statement of the Scientific American in this connection is as follows: "In the Scientific American of December 28, 1918, we made known the very gratifying fact, that with the elimination of the German Navy, the United States Navy moved into second place. We showed also that because our allies lost many of their capital ships, and stopped work during the war upon those they were building, our Navy is so strong a second that it is equal in dreadnaught strength to the three navies of France, Italy and Japan. The United States possesses 19 dreadnaughts, Japan 9, France 7, and Italy 5. We found also that because of the superior gun power, armor protection, and displacement of our vessels, our 19 ships were fully a match in strength and fighting power, for the 21 ships of the nations enumerated. Our total of 19 United States dreadnaughts was based on the statement of the chief constructor, to a congressional committee to that effect.

"The end of the world war finds the allied powers war weary and eager for relief from the burden of maintaining huge armaments both on sea and land. Americans returning from the other side, whether they be officers of the Army or Navy, or civilians, tell us that all of our allies, now that the German threat is gone, are prepared to make a pro rata reduction of their armaments."

Excluding England, the three nations just mentioned are the three greatest naval powers of the world who may be treated as our possible adversaries. But if our present battleship strength is equal to that of these possible adversaries, and these adversaries show no indications of activity in new naval construction, are we justified at this time in burdening our people, and alarming the world, by hastily authorizing the immense addition proposed to our present Navy? We should deal with this situation as intelligent Representatives, having in mind dangers reasonably to be apprehended, not mere possibilities. Any nation, or combination of nations, may be considered as a possible enemy, but we should not establish our national policy upon a theory of possibilities. I am unable to say, and no one in this body is able to say, what the future holds in the way of possibilities. At some time in that unknown and unexplored future it is possible that we may have to fight an embattled world. Our possible adversaries may be England,

France, Italy, Germany, rejuvenated Russia, Japan, and every other free nation, and autocratic government on earth. Who can say? The combination of nations I have suggested, may not be excluded as a possible adversary, but who would be willing to vote money to establish and maintain a navy sufficient to protect this country against so unlikely and remote a combination? In the realm of speculation we may not be able to exclude the possibility of such a combination of adversaries, but we would be all agreed that the likelihood of danger from such a quarter, would be so remote that no sane man would concern himself to provide against it.

Armies and navies, when not needed for the national defense, are per se burdens, and are not to be voted lightly upon the country. They should be established with exclusive regard for internal and external safety. To the extent they exceed the national requirements in either direction, they are merely mischievous extravagances. The determination of an appropriate military and naval policy is a purely legislative function, and should be determined, as other legislative problems, in the exercise of our best judgment.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Just for a question.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is the gentleman familiar with the cablegram recently sent by the President to certain Members of the House?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I am not. Is the gentleman? Mr. LONGWORTH. I happen to be.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Very well, what of it?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I want to ask the gentleman whether he thinks it makes for wise legislation that some Members of the House should be in possession of certain information and others not?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That inquiry has nothing whatever to do with the inquiry whether the policy proposed by this bill is wise, or unwise. Concede that the answer to your question should be no, and what then? The immediate inquiry that concerns the members of this committee, is whether in the discharge of our duty as prudent and discreet legislators we should follow the recommendations of the Naval Committee, and enact the legislation which it recommends. If it is made clear to us that our national security requires the construction of the additional battleships, and cruisers proposed, then nothing remains to be said. The necessary credits should be voted before the rising of to-morrow's sun. *Salus reipublicae est suprema lex.* I have stated, Mr. Chairman, that looking the world over to-day, and always excepting England, there is not a naval power, viewing the nations in succession as possible antagonists, either singly, or in likely combination, that threatens, or menaces the naval supremacy of the United States even on our present basis of naval strength, and excluding the program of 1916 which, in the main, remains to be constructed. I admit that with respect to our strength upon the high seas our Navy as at present constituted, or even with the completed program of 1916, would not be as powerful as the British grand fleet.

But it has never been proposed that our fleet should match the British fleet. I am familiar with the arguments that have been advanced in this body during the last 12 years, and during that entire period it has always been maintained that in determining the naval policy of the United States, we could always exclude Great Britain as a factor in the problem. Both in the debates in the House, and in the testimony before the committee, it has been agreed that a proper building policy for this country was in no wise to be determined or affected by the extent of the English activities.

I quote again from that big Navy organ, the *Scientific American*:

"We find that there is a practically unanimous conviction that the strength of the British Navy is warranted by her island position and the scattered condition of the British Empire, and that it is sufficient that we should be a powerful second. Particularly strong is this conviction among the officers of the battle squadron which you recently reviewed on its return from cooperation with the British fleet in the North Sea."

"If there is anybody of expert opinion that is qualified to judge whether the British fleet is a menace to the peace of the world, it is to be found surely, among these American officers, who have spent a whole year with that fleet in the most intimate intercourse and cooperation. They frankly express their conviction that the British Navy is regarded both by officers and civilians of Great Britain as a purely protective force, built up and maintained for the sole purpose of keeping open the trade routes between Great Britain and her widely-scattered colonies."

"The persistent advocacy, even before the peace conference has opened, of huge increases in the United States Navy has filled all thoughtful people, not merely among our allies, but here in America, with amazement and deep-seated concern."

I would like to be advised whether as one result of a war waged to free the world from the menace of an autocratic power which sunk our ships, and murdered our citizens on the high seas, a war in which we fought shoulder to shoulder with Great Britain, and so fighting, won a glorious and never to be forgotten victory, we are to treat our whilom comrade as a possible enemy, and viewing him, as we aforesaid viewed Germany, order our policy accordingly, and proceed to build battleships upon a scale of surpassing magnitude in order to protect this country against the menace of this new adversary. [Applause.]

New ties have been established by the sorrows and the sufferings of this war, jointly endured by the Anglo-Saxon nations. I had fondly believed that the experiences of the fiery furnace of trial through which we had jointly passed had served to draw us more closely than ever to that mother race from which we spring, and that the peace between the two nations which has been unbroken for over a century now be fairly considered as perpetual and infrangible. The burdens of this war are surely heavy enough, without the suggestion that as another outcome of this frightful strife, we must regard our only English-speaking ally as a possible enemy in the determination of our future naval policy.

If that is to be true, then assuredly the war has brought us new burdens. In the effort to establish our security by the overthrow of the one power that menaced it, can it be that we have succeeded in some mysterious fashion in placing the one power that we have heretofore excluded from consideration in all of our computations of naval construction, and all our estimates of probable enemies, in the category of possible antagonist, and for the future must consider her programs of naval construction as carrying a possible menace to this country. Having fought as allies to destroy the menacing power of autocracy, must we now part company, and at this very time when the peans of victory resound in our ears, begin with feverish haste to prepare for the day of conflict with our whilom ally? If we exclude England from contemplation, as we have excluded her during the last three decades, then what fleet, or fleets of possible adversaries, require us to establish this supplementary program?

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. One question.

Mr. BRITTEN. Does the gentleman recall the secret treaty entered into between Great Britain and Japan that gave to Japan the islands in the Pacific, some of them surrounding our great naval base, in the last three years?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I suppose the implication that the gentleman intends to convey by that question is that this country should construct its future fighting fleets with reference to Great Britain as a possible adversary. If his implication does not mean that, then what does it mean? If that is what the Naval Committee, and the naval experts have in mind, then they should be manly enough, and frank enough to say to the American people that as one result of the great war, our relations with Great Britain have been so altered that we must reverse the attitude of the past, and so far from excluding that country from the category of nations proper to be considered in the determination of our building program, we must in the future consider the menace of her fleet in ascertaining the number and strength of the ships required for adequate national defense. If it is considered that a new factor has been projected into the problem of national security, and if that factor is the menace of England's fleet, then that fact should be plainly announced so that the Congress may act intelligently, and reach its own conclusions upon the necessity for this supplementary program. The cryptic and mysterious intimations of the gentleman from Illinois are not enlightening. Give us the facts, so that we may act advisedly, and intelligently. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another feature of the situation—

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I prefer not to yield at this time, if the gentleman will wait until I finish the statement of what I now have in mind.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I was rather interested in suggesting one question to the gentleman.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Well, I will yield.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. My recollection is that the gentleman from Virginia in the past has generally had great faith that America never would need even the Navy we have now.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I have always favored a Navy sufficient to protect this country against all dangers reasonably to be apprehended.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Because my recollection is that the gentleman almost invariably voted against the increase in the Navy.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I have always been against unreasonable and unnecessary increases.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Is the gentleman so sure of the future, based upon his past prophecies, as to the needs of America?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Far more sure.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Please state why the gentleman now is—

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will so state with a great deal of pleasure. I have never favored a policy of nonresistance either on the land, or the sea. I have always favored a Navy that, so far as I could determine from my study of the available authorities, the experts, if you choose to call them so, would be equal to the Navy of any other country that could reasonably be regarded as a menace to this country. Great Britain was always excluded by the naval experts themselves from the list of possible enemies.

Within the past few months the one country that really threatened the peace of the world, the one country that has been continually used by the naval expansionists to alarm this country into voting for new construction on an extensive scale, has been completely eliminated as a naval power. Her entire fleet is in the hands of her adversaries, and at their mercy. The present plan is to destroy every one of these ships.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. We are getting away from my question.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Not at all. I am proceeding to show you that our present Navy secures us against any danger reasonably to be apprehended, and in that connection I referred to the passing of Germany as a naval power. I have given the figures of the combined dreadnaught strength of France, Italy, and Japan. Is France a menace to this country? Is she building new navies? Are her yards humming with new construction?

What of Italy? Do you really think that we need additional ships to protect our interests against danger from that quarter? Does the naval strength of Japan alarm you? Is she an adversary reasonably likely to attack this country? If so, having in mind the relative strength of the navies of Japan, and the United States, what do you imagine would be the outcome of a naval war between this country, and the island empire? How and in what way does the navy of Japan menace the peace and security of the United States? [Applause.]

You ask me what I have to say with respect to my attitude in the past. I can answer in a few words.

I would not retract a single vote that I have cast on the naval programs. I was against the naval program of 1916, holding that it was not needed for the national defense. Subsequent events have vindicated that attitude. If not a single great ship had ever been built under that program, and none so far has been constructed, this war would have been won, just as it has been won. If the ships provided by that program had been in being, and ready to go to sea when war was declared, I mean the great battleships, they could not have been used.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. We would not have won it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. We helped to win it. I am discussing our contribution to the war. It was a material contribution but not in the form of battleships.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Is the gentleman willing that we should always accept the assistance of others?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. We did not require assistance. We went to the assistance of others, with torpedo boats, mine sweepers, and light cruisers, not with battleships. Upon what theory do we build a Navy? Why upon the theory that it is needed for the maintenance of our safety and interests. We have never undertaken to build a Navy as great as that of Great Britain, for the simple reason that it has never been considered that our interests required a Navy of that size.

The naval program contemplated by the act of 1916 has played no part whatsoever in the present war, for the simple reason that it has never come into being. With Germany eliminated we may safely omit the construction of much of that program, not to speak of the supplementary program provided in this bill. We played a notable part in the recent war, but it was with our lighter ships that were on hand when war was declared. To these should be added the ships completed during the progress of the war, the destroyers, submarines, mine layers, mine sweepers, and other small craft.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Did the gentleman vote for any of the warships or battleships that are now in the water?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Oh, yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. How many of them?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not know. I can not say. You do not know in the aggregate how many you voted

for. [Laughter.] In all likelihood when you voted for four, I voted for two, and when you voted for two, I voted for one. Possibly there were occasions when I did not consider that any additional construction was needed, having in mind the ships in being, and the additional ships that had been provided for in previous authorizations.

But at all times I had in mind to provide our country with an adequate Navy, one that would be sufficient to make her secure against all dangers reasonably to be apprehended. No vote that any so-called little navy man has cast in the last decade has left our country unprepared to play an adequate part in the recent hostilities. The little navy men so called have favored a larger construction of submarines, torpedo boats and swift cruisers, and fewer great dreadnaughts. Our material contribution to the recent naval war was in the way of small craft, not in ponderous and expensive battleships. The heavy ships never went into action, many of them never went across. Our present dreadnaught strength is ample for our adequate protection against the dreadnaught strength of other nations, always excluding England. Should the other nations begin new programs of dreadnaught or other naval construction, I rather fancy that we can build as fast as they can.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. In other words, won by the strength of other powers.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Not at all. It was won with our help, but not with our dreadnaughts. The bulk of these great ships swung idly at their anchors on this side of the Atlantic. Our dreadnaughts were not needed, for the simple reason that England's supply was more than sufficient. I ask again, who, and where are the adversaries that we are supposed to be arming against? If conditions are such that more ships are not needed for national defense, is it suggested that this body in a merely grandiose spirit shall impose upon the American people burdens that will soon amount to a thousand millions of dollars a year for the maintenance of the Navy, not to speak of the cost of construction. Certainly I do not favor such a policy. I am in favor of building as large an American Navy as our interests, and just considerations of urgency require.

Now tell me how large that Navy should be? What is your test, what is your standard. If we had potential enemies when this war began, assuredly the most menacing and dangerous of those enemies has been destroyed. Does the fact of his elimination render us less, or more secure? If we are more secure, why new armaments on an expanding scale? Suppose the present war had been confined to a death grapple on the high seas between this country and Germany. Does anyone on this floor, knowing the facts in reference to the strength of the present American Navy, doubt that we would have emerged as victors from that strife?

Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to weary the House with unnecessary details. I would not object to this naval program if it were merely a fantastic conception dealing with fantastic and unreal dangers and not requiring action on our part, or calling for vast sums of money. Not at all. The gentlemen might dream their dreams undisturbed. But I know full well that the burden proposed to be laid upon this country for armaments, first for a Navy of the minimum size proposed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY], and second for an Army of the minimum size proposed by our General Staff, will retard our national development, will withdraw countless thousands of men from useful and productive activities, and will erect obstructing barriers in the way of the full enjoyment of life and liberty, and the pursuit of happiness by the American people. [Applause.]

I am asking you, gentlemen of the committee, to point out the necessity for this program, and if you can establish that necessity, I will join you as an ally, and fight under your banner.

When war was in progress, no one voted more willingly than I did for the legislation that was necessary for the maintenance of American interests and the winning of the war. No man in this House voted more readily than I did, for the imposition of the burdens that this country will carry to remote generations, but I was moved to this action by the fact that the success of the American cause depended upon the funds that this legislation afforded. I am as ready as any Member of this body on either side of the House to do whatever may be necessary for American security, American rights, and American interests. I would not hesitate for one moment to vote for this program, if it was essential to our security and the maintenance of our vital interests. But I ask the Naval Committee to tell us something more than it has told us in the elaborate report which it has filed.

The report tells that "an adequate Navy is necessary." That sheds a great light upon the situation, does it not [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of general debate has been limited by the House.

Mr. PADGETT. I can not agree to an extension of the time. The House has fixed the time, and the committee can not extend it; but I will yield five minutes to the gentleman out of my time.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I maintain this proposition, that an intelligent program of national defense must be directed by intelligence, and that no one can act intelligently unless he has the information necessary for action. No one can determine what an appropriate military and naval program should be, unless he is put in possession of all of the necessary facts. I take it that in the determination of a national policy we should not be controlled by the ambiguous, not to say unintelligible assertion, that our country needs an adequate Navy. This body is as competent to act intelligently upon the whole facts as the committee. In this connection I desire to call the attention of the House to the fact that according to the contention of the naval experts, we are \$700,000,000 short of an adequate Navy. If the House is expected to follow the experts, the question may well be asked, Why did not the committee follow them? These experts gave their judgment as to what was needed for an adequate Navy, and fixed it at \$1,414,064,000.15.

With great apparent satisfaction the committee calls attention to the fact that the Secretary of the Navy, who himself is not an expert, reduced the estimate for the program submitted by the naval experts by several hundred millions of dollars. Proceeding further, the committee, a nonexpert body, have reduced the figures of the nonexpert Secretary of the Navy, and reported a bill that is over \$650,000,000 short of the amount required to provide adequate naval protection, in the judgment of the naval experts. Does the committee think that the bill which they report, and which flouts the recommendations of the Secretary of the Navy and of the naval experts, will afford the country a really adequate Navy? If the committee can reduce the recommendations of the experts over \$650,000,000 may not the Members of this House, in the exercise of an intelligent judgment, effect a further reduction in this gigantic bill, and still afford the country adequate protection? [Applause.] Are we not entitled, as custodians of American interests, to use a like discretion to that used by the members of the committee? [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I will submit one final request, and that is that in the course of this debate some one gentleman, speaking for the committee, will tell us what are the dangers reasonably to be apprehended by this country, and against which we must prepare on the tremendous scale proposed, and if this spokesman can not tell us what are the dangers reasonably to be apprehended, will he at least advise us as to the cloud shapes of danger that rear their turbulent and menacing heads above the rim of the horizon of the future? That much at least, we are entitled to know. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has again expired.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. WILSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 15 minutes.

[Mr. WILSON of Texas addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

During the delivery of the speech of Mr. WILSON of Texas favoring the proposed three-year naval building program, and while discussing the telegram from the President in which he recommended the authorization of such program, the following transpired:

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Now, will the gentleman yield for a question right there?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. On the day that the President's telegram was made public in the United States he made a speech in the French Chamber of Deputies in Paris in which he congratulated the deputies there assembled and the world that there would now be a diminution of armaments throughout the world, relieving the people of that great burden. Now, as a Member of this House, I want to know his impelling reason—why at the same time he is congratulating the rest of the world

that they could disarm he should be urging us to arm? Can the gentleman give us the reason for that?

Mr. WILSON of Texas. In order that the speech of the President be not misconstrued, I am going to ask permission now to print it in full in to-day's Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks leave to extend his remarks as indicated. Is there any objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Our President needs no defense from anyone, but, since this question is raised, it is proper that his speech should go into the Record while we are considering this bill, in order that it may be reconciled with his recommendation by gentlemen who want to, and in order that excerpts from it may not be taken and used by anyone to create confusion and misunderstanding and the impression that the President is not consistent. The speech was made in the Chamber of Deputies at Paris the 3d day of this month, with official France present, the Associated Press dispatch, including the speech, being as follows:

PARIS, February 3.

President Wilson this evening delivered an address in the Chamber of Deputies, having as auditors President Poincaré, the presidents of the Chamber and the Senate and large numbers of members of both Houses of Parliament and the personnel of the French cabinet.

The President was accompanied to the Palais Bourbon by President Poincaré, who called for him at the Murat mansion. Premier Clemenceau and M. Dubost, speaker of the Senate, also were in the party.

Military honors were rendered by the republican guard, resplendent in new uniforms and their full regalia. The presidential party entered the Chamber amid a fanfare of bugles and the rolling of drums.

Mrs. Wilson, Mme. Poincaré, and Mme. Deschanel had seats in the presidential gallery.

CHEER FOR FIVE MINUTES.

As President Wilson rose and walked toward the tribune with a quick step, the deputies, senators, and others rose and cheered and applauded for fully five minutes. The audience insisted on hearing the President's address standing. M. Poincaré, Clemenceau, and Dubost also stood. This seemed to embarrass President Wilson, who made gestures that the deputies remain seated, but they shouted: "Standing! We will hear you standing!"

President Wilson turned to M. Deschanel, begging him to request that the deputies be seated, but the president of the Chamber shrugged his shoulders, as if helpless, and President Wilson began in a low voice, which gained force as he proceeded.

There was a ripple of applause now and then as he was speaking, but the majority of the deputies and senators were unable to understand English clearly, thus the enthusiasm did not break out until the interpreter translated the speech. Then deputies and senators gave full vent to their feelings. President Wilson spoke as follows:

PRESIDENT'S SPEECH.

"I am keenly aware of the unusual and distinguished honor you are paying me by permitting me to meet you in this place and to address you from this historic platform.

"Indeed, sir, as day has followed day and week has followed week in this hospitable land of France I have felt the sense of comradeship ever become more and more intimate, and it has seemed to me that the making of history was becoming singularly clear.

"We knew before this war began that France and America were united in affection. We knew the occasions which drew the two nations together in those years, which now seem so far away, when the world was first beginning to thrill with the impulse of human liberty, when the soldiers of France came to help the struggling little Republic of America to get on its feet and proclaim one of the first victories of freedom.

"We had never forgotten that, but we did not see the full meaning of it. A hundred years and more went by and the spindles were slowly weaving the web of history. We did not see it to be complete, the whole of the design to be made plain.

DIVERGING LINES MEET.

"Now, look what has happened. In that far-off day when France came to the assistance of America, America was fighting Great Britain. And now she is linked as closely to Great Britain as she is to France. We see now how these apparently diverging lines of history are coming together. The nations which once stood in battle array against one another are now shoulder to shoulder fighting a common enemy.

"It was a long time before we saw that, and in the last four years something has happened that is unprecedented in the history of mankind. It is nothing less than this—that bodies of men on both sides of the sea and in all parts of the world have come to realize their comradeship in freedom.

"France in the meantime, as we have so often said, stood at the frontier of freedom. Her lines lay along the very lines that divided the home of freedom from the home of military despotism. Hers was the immediate peril. Hers was the constant dread. Hers was the most pressing necessity of preparation, and she had constantly to ask herself this question: 'If the blow falls, who will come to our assistance?'

"And the question was answered in the most unexpected way. Her allies came to her assistance, but many more than her allies. The free people of the world came to her assistance.

AMERICA PAYS HER DEBT.

"And in this way America paid her debt of gratitude to France by sending her sons to fight upon the soil of France. She did more. She assisted in drawing the forces of the world together in order that France might never again feel her isolation; in order that France might never feel that hers was a lonely peril, and would never again have to ask the question who would come to her assistance.

"For the alternative is a terrible alternative for France. I do not need to point out to you that east of you in Europe the future is full of question. Beyond the Rhine, across Germany, across Poland, across Russia, across Asia, there are questions unanswered, and they may be for the present unanswerable.

"France still stands at the frontier. France still stands in the presence of those threatening and unanswered questions—threatening because unanswered; stands waiting for the solution of matters which touch her directly and intimately and constantly; and if she must stand

alone, what must she do? She must put upon her people a constant burden of taxation. She must undergo sacrifice that may become intolerable.

NATIONS MUST BE READY.

"And not only she but the other nations of the world must do the like. They must be ready for any terrible incident of injustice. The thing is not inconceivable.

"I visited the other day a portion of the devastated region of France. I saw the noble city of Rheims in ruins, and I could not help saying to myself, 'Here is where the blow fell, because the rulers of the world did not sooner see how to prevent it.'

"The rulers of the world have been thinking of the relations of governments and forgetting the relations of peoples. They have been thinking of the maneuvers of international dealings, when what they ought to have been thinking of was the fortunes of men and women and the safety of home and the care that they should take that their people should be happy because they were safe.

"They know that the only way to do this is to make it certain that the same thing will not always happen that has happened this time, that there never shall be any doubt or waiting or surmise, but that whenever France or any free people is threatened the whole world will be ready to vindicate its liberty.

"It is for that reason, I take it, that I find such a warm and intelligent enthusiasm in France for the society of nations—France with her keen vision, France with her prophetic vision.

IS MANKIND'S NEED.

"It seems to be not only the need of France, but the need of mankind. And France sees the sacrifices which are necessary for the establishment of the society of nations are not to be compared with the constant dread of another catastrophe falling on the fair cities and areas of France.

"There was a no more beautiful country. There was a no more prosperous country. There was a no more free-spirited people. All the world had admired France, and none of the world grudged France her greatness and her prosperity except those who grudged her liberty and her prosperity. And it has profited us, terribly as the cost has been, to witness what has happened, to see with the physical eye what has happened, because injustice was wrought.

"The president of the chamber has pictured, as I can not picture, the appalling sufferings, the terrible tragedy of France, but it is a tragedy which could not be repeated. As the pattern of history has disclosed itself it has disclosed the hearts of men drawing toward one another. Comradships have become vivid. The purpose of association has become evident.

BROTHERHOOD PLAN NEARS.

"The nations of the world are about to consummate a brotherhood which will make it unnecessary in the future to maintain those crushing armaments which make the peoples suffer almost as much in peace as they suffered in war.

"When the soldiers of America crossed the ocean they did not bring with them merely their arms. They brought with them a very vivid conception of France. They landed upon the soil of France with quickened pulses. They knew that they had come to do a thing which the heart of America had long wished to do. When Gen. Pershing stood at the tomb of Lafayette and said, 'Lafayette, we are here!' it was as if he had said, 'Lafayette, here is the completion of the great story whose first chapters you assisted to write.'

"The world has seen the great plot worked out, and now the people of France may rest assured that their prosperity is secure because their homes are secure; and men everywhere not only wish her safety and prosperity, but are ready to assure her that with all the force and wealth at their command they will guarantee her security and safety.

"So, as we sit from day to day at the Quai d'Orsay, I think to myself we might, if we could gain an audience of the free peoples of the world, adopt the language of Gen. Pershing and say, 'Friends, men, humble women, little children, we are here; we are here as your friends, as your champions, as your representatives. We have come to work out for you a world which is fit to live in and in which all countries can enjoy the heritage of liberty for which France and America and England and Italy have paid so dear.'

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 20 minutes remaining.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I do not know that I shall consume all of the 20 minutes. I thought it proper to refer to some matters adverted to heretofore. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] referred to the chaotic condition in Russia and in Germany, the disintegration of Turkey, and we read in the papers about the spread of bolshevism, the breakdown of organized government, and the weakness and inability there of constituted authority to maintain peace and order and international relations and international obligations.

I readily concede that a condition almost of chaos and anarchy exists in all that great part of the world, involving many hundreds of millions of people. And as I stand before you I ask you seriously and solemnly in the face of that condition, involving one-half of the population of the world, Are we not going to look at our preparation, are we going to turn our backs to the past, and close our eyes to the future and make our ears deaf to any suggestion that the great people of the United States do not desire, purpose, or intend to make themselves a protectorate of any other country of the world?

We have a condition to-day and for the future that is different from what it has ever been before. It is true we have the same great coast line on two oceans, extending for thousands of miles; we have great cities, with disturbed and uncertain conditions abroad; we have resting on us the obligations as to our international duties, a responsibility to our citizens when they travel abroad; we have it to maintain toward the citizens of other countries that may come here. With all of these diversified duties and obligations mingled and mixed with all these

conditions, I repeat, Is there not to us in the very suggestion of the gentleman a duty that we shall not neglect our own protection and our own care? [Applause.]

Again, I want to call attention to the fact, and I want to make it plain, that we are not building against any nation; we are building for the United States—not that we loved Caesar less, but that we love Rome more; or, if I may bring it down from the expression of ancient days, we are not preparing against any nation toward which we entertain or maintain any spirit of hostility or enmity, but looking with love, with patriotic devotion to the great and diversified interests of the United States, prompted by a desire to preserve and be ready at all times to protect the interests of the United States. It is our country that we love, and no other country do we hate. That is the purpose and the spirit and the intent that has moved the Committee on Naval Affairs in submitting to you for your consideration and asking your approval of the proposals that are contained in this bill. I believe that we can address it to your intelligence, to your judgment, and to your patriotism, and spurn to appeal to any sense of enmity, ill will, or jealousy of any other country in the world.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Chairman, may I interrupt there with a single question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. McCORMICK. How does this plan comport with that one of the 14 points which proposes the reduction of armaments to the lowest point consistent with domestic security?

Mr. PADGETT. I will be very glad to answer that, and I want here to pay tribute to my confidence and my firm belief and conviction in the sincerity of our President, who is abroad, laboring to accomplish, if it can be done, that result. [Applause on Democratic side.] Yet, let me say that when the President stood in yonder place and spoke to the Senate and the House he used this language:

I earnestly recommend the uninterrupted pursuit of that policy of continued naval program. It would clearly be unwise for us to attempt to adjust our programs to a future world policy yet undetermined.

I do not know what is going to come out of the league of nations; I do not know what is going to issue out of the contention and the work to bring about a disarmament; but I do know that if there is any league of nations established that that nation which has a predominant sea power will exercise a predominant influence and control in that league, and I do know that I want the United States to be able, for her dignity, for her honor, for her glory, and for the performance of her international duties and obligations, to be prepared to make in that league of nations a contribution equal to that of any other country, so that in the partnership we will be an equal partner and not a minority stockholder. Let us face the issue fair and square. It brings me back to the statement I made a moment ago. With our great merchant marine, with our seacoast, with the transformation of the financial centers of the world, and all these duties and obligations that rest upon us, I want the contribution of the United States to equal that of any other country.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I desire the gentleman from Tennessee to set me straight, as he has often done heretofore on other matters, about one matter to which I desire to direct his attention. I am somewhat confused. I have heard the chairman of the committee speak of the necessity of increasing our armament to a certain size because of our extensive sea borders. That seems to be in conflict with what the President of the United States said when he opened the convention abroad, because the President is then reported to have spoken as follows:

In a sense the United States is less interested in this subject than the other nations here assembled. With her great territory and her extensive sea borders, it is less likely that the United States should suffer from the attack of enemies than that other nations should suffer.

I can not understand that.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I shall answer the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania as I understand it. I do not think the President meant to be understood that with a long seacoast we are not liable to be attacked.

Mr. BUTLER. I could not tell about that. I simply read what the President said, and at the time it impressed me as a contradiction of our views in recommending the naval program.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think the President is to be understood as meaning what the words there, as the gentleman has submitted them, may be interpreted to mean.

Mr. BUTLER. I can not understand it. He says with our great territory—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, I am not doing this for the purpose of in any way criticizing anything that the President may have said. I do not quite understand it—

With her great territory and her extensive sea borders, it is less likely that the United States should suffer from the attack of enemies than that other nations should suffer.

Mr. PADGETT. I could not answer that. I do not know whether that is a correct quotation of what the President said. I do not know the connection in which it was said, but there is one thing certain and that is that with the great seacoast we have, we all know that in time of war it would be an exposure to danger.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. McCORMICK. A moment ago the chairman of the committee suggested, as I understood him, that the power which possessed the greatest fleet would dominate the councils of the league of nations to enforce peace—not that power which had the greatest population or whose cause was the most just, but that which had the greatest armament. If that be true, Mr. Chairman, does not the gentleman from Tennessee suggest that the league of nations to enforce peace is an invitation to arm in order that you may have assets to control its deliberations and to determine the decision of the "justiciable disputes"?

Mr. PADGETT. I know that there are two phases of the question, and it is assumed that in the league it may rightly be assumed that in many phases of it the idea advanced by the gentleman would be the predominant idea, but there are—

Mr. McCORMICK. But the idea was advanced by the gentleman from Tennessee that if you would be heard and carry weight within the league you must arm.

Mr. PADGETT. I know this to be true, that in every combination of human energy and human effort, in stock companies, in banks, in corporations, and all sorts of organizations the fellow who is the majority stockholder exercises the power and the influence. I know another thing, that in the big States of the Union there is influence that counts, and I would suppose that in the league of nations, if in the frailty of human nature, in the weakness or in the heat of passion, there should come a decision in that league, the gentleman would not want the United States to be a minority stockholder or to be under the protectorate of some other country.

Mr. BUTLER. But we do not want to hold all the stock.

Mr. McCORMICK. The President suggested it is to be a peace of the common man and not of the majority stockholders.

Mr. PADGETT. We want the United States as one of the common stockholders to own an equal share with others. Now, then, another matter I want to call attention to is this, that the Navy is the proper, logical, and sensible defense of the United States. Separated as we are from other countries with an ocean on either side, a Navy upon the high seas protects us from an army coming upon our shores, and as long as we have a Navy we can dispense with an Army. I am not going to consume the time of this committee in attempting to recite the splendid performance of our Navy in this last war. It is known of all; it is approved of all; it is a source of pride, satisfaction, and glory to the American people. My friends, one other thought: Let us be consistent; let us pursue the policy that we adopted in 1916 of not building haphazard, but to look at a program embracing several years and live up to it and meet the duties and the obligations that rest upon us.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I understand the present existing program, the yards will not be able to complete it for three years?

Mr. PADGETT. That has been our contention all along.

Mr. STAFFORD. Now, we are proposing a program that can not take any form until three years in the future?

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, no.

Mr. STAFFORD. I mean as far as building is concerned?

Mr. PADGETT. No; we can lay down two of each type of ship along about next May of the fiscal year for which we are providing.

Mr. STAFFORD. My information was that nothing could be done for at least two and mayhap three years in the future?

Mr. PADGETT. No. We can begin the laying down of them in the latter part of the fiscal year for which we provide.

Mr. STAFFORD. When is it contemplated that this program will be completed?

Mr. PADGETT. It will take about seven years, and I will explain that to the gentleman.

Mr. STAFFORD. Congress is not intended to be in adjournment during that period, is it?

Mr. BRITTEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Let me finish this. This is a three-year program for 10 battleships and 10 scout cruisers, and it is suggested in the bill that during the first fiscal year of the three we start the construction of two battleships and two scout cruisers. It will take not less than three years to complete those. In the second-year program they would start four battleships and four scout cruisers. It would take three years from the

starting of them to finish the battleships. That would run it for four years. Then you take the next one, the third year you start them; you take the remaining four battleships and remaining four scout cruisers and it will take three years to complete the battleships. That runs it up to six years, but as we do not begin them until in 1920 it would run until 1926 before they were completed, and this authorization we made of \$412,000,000 would be distributed and divided up in the seven years in which construction would be carried on.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired; all time has expired.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL EXPENSES.

The Secretary of the Navy shall send to Congress at the beginning of its next regular session a complete schedule or list showing the amount of money of all pay and for all allowances for each grade of officers in the Navy, including retired officers, and for all officers included in this act and for all enlisted men so included.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object—and I do not propose to object—but I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee whether the gentleman proposes to allow during consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule general discussion of the naval policy, with extensions of time, when any Member takes the floor?

Mr. PADGETT. I have no objection to a reasonable extension of time for the purpose of discussing the matters in the bill, but I do not want to extend time with reference to outside matters that do not relate to the bill. Is the gentleman going to discuss the bill?

Mr. LONDON. I will discuss the policy—the naval policy.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask leave to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, we have before us a bill appropriating for the purposes of the Navy a sum of money which only a short time ago was considered sufficient for all the purposes of the Government, a sum of money larger than the total annual prewar appropriations of all European countries combined. We are asked to impose upon the people this heavy burden after the war has been won.

We thought we were through with the world crisis. We were evidently mistaken. It looks as if the armies and navies of the allies have won the war, but as if the people have lost the war. Instead of general rejoicings such as one would expect after the conclusion of a great struggle there is fear, restlessness, uncertainty, and anxiety—anxiety as to the present and anxiety as to the future. I shall attempt to explain it. It is a sad fact that this country has had no definite international policy and that it has none now. This is certainly true as far as the two political parties—the Republican and the Democratic Parties—are concerned.

In 1916 the majority party in Congress was elected on a platform of "He kept us out of war." The charge has been made by Republicans since that the Democrats were insincere in 1916. But the Republicans had nothing to offer in 1916. They knew then that there was a Kaiser in Germany. They knew then that Belgium had been invaded in 1914. They, the Republicans, did not demand in 1916 that the country enter the war. On the contrary, they sought to avoid the issue of war. When pressed for an answer to the question, "What would you have done?" the presidential candidate of the Republican Party finally picked up enough courage and declared that he would have taken possession of the German ships interned in American harbors. That was as far as he would go.

About six weeks before the country declared war the President had asked for armed neutrality. If you will read the speeches delivered during the discussion of the armed-neutrality bill you will find that almost every man who spoke for it argued that it was sure to keep us out of war. Everybody professed anxiety that the country be kept out of war. That was in the beginning of March of 1917. The armed-neutrality bill failed of passage in the Senate.

In April Congress declared war by an overwhelming majority. The legal ground was the invasion of the right of Americans to travel on the seas without danger to their lives. America's

right to freedom of the seas had been invaded. During a short address which I delivered in February, 1917, I asked this question: "What will the United States win if it wins the war? Italy will get 'Italia Irredente,' France will get Alsace-Lorraine, Russia will get Constantinople; Germany, if she wins, will have destroyed a great commercial rival; England, if she wins, will succeed in strengthening her world empire. What will the United States win if we win?" The answer was that we would win the right to unmolested travel on the seas in the next war, because in peace times that right was not disturbed.

As things stand now, the very phrase "freedom of the seas" is yet to be interpreted. Immediately after the declaration of war there was a general feeling that the fight for the right to travel on the seas unmolested during the time of war, and for that only, would not appeal to the heart of the American people. So new slogans were created. I do not say that they were created dishonestly. On the contrary, I do wish the President of the United States success in his work. I believe that he is right in being where he is now, trying to get the best he can for America and humanity out of this crisis. [Applause.] I am not saying it in criticism. I would readily give my life to promote the things he has announced he stands for.

The truth is that he has more loyal and genuine support in the socialist movement of the world than among the Tories and plutocrats and munition manufacturers of Europe and of America. There is no doubt about that. I know you would not have the courage to applaud that statement, because there is too much truth in it. But it is a fact anyway.

The President announced a new slogan, "We will make the world safe for democracy; we will try to get rid of the Kaiser and do away with autocracy." Of course, the country knew that at one time there was a Czar in Russia, and the Czar of Russia was not a bit better than the Emperor of Germany. The country knew that there was a Sultan in Turkey, and no effort was made to democratize his peculiar institutions. But the slogan was proclaimed, "We are going to make the world safe from the evils of autocracy."

Well, that was not strong enough. Then the President and all other statesmen came out with the slogan, "We are going to make this the last war." Mothers were told that their boys were being sent across to France so as to make this the last war. This did appeal to the hearts and souls of men. And the most radical of radicals, the most extreme of extreme Socialists and revolutionists said, "Oh, yes; that is something worth while fighting for. We will make this the last war." And, as I pointed out in my speech in January, 1918, the President's 14 points—which, by the way, were proclaimed by the entire press of the country as a new Sermon on the Mount, a new and noble code of international ethics—there was not a Republican newspaper that criticized those 14 points. On the contrary, the custom was then to praise anything that the President said as the greatest and the grandest and the profoundest thing that has ever been said by any human being. And those 14 points were proclaimed to be the wisest thing that ever came from the brain or lips of man. I started out to say that in a speech which I delivered on the floor of this House on the 11th of January, 1918, I pointed out the fact that these 14 points were in substance the 15 points presented by the revolutionary movement of Russia.

We are now told that these 14 points are not what we have been fighting for.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to know at the outset of the consideration of the bill under the five-minute rule what is to be the policy of the chairman as to the consideration of the bill and how long it is his intention to run to-night?

Mr. PADGETT. I announced this morning that I want to finish the bill by to-morrow night, and I want to run as late to-night as necessary, and see if we can finish it to-morrow.

Mr. STAFFORD. If that is the policy, if you are going to allow everybody unlimited time under the five-minute rule, you could run until midnight to-night and to-morrow night and not finish the bill. I do not think it is fair to the membership to grant these unlimited extensions of time.

Mr. PADGETT. I will have to object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We can stay here until midnight. I hope the gentleman will not object.

Mr. PADGETT. I will not object now, but let me say that hereafter I will object.

Mr. DIES. I want to say to the chairman, before he makes that statement, that I have not taken up any time heretofore in

the debate, but I shall want 10 minutes as soon as the gentleman gets through.

Mr. PADGETT. On the bill itself?

Mr. DIES. Yes; on the bill itself.

Mr. PADGETT. I am willing to allow full discussion on the bill itself.

Mr. BUTLER. On the bill and on the policy involved.

Mr. DIES. Otherwise I may make a number of five-minute speeches. But if I can get 10 minutes I think in that time I can get out of my system what I have to say. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for five minutes more.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Chairman, many of our statesmen are now opposed to the very things that the President has informed the world this country stands for; the very things on which he bases his appeal to the conscience of the world—disarmament, the doing away with conscription, the establishment of some arrangement among the nations of the world which will substitute moral force or, in the worst stage, the economic boycott for physical force. These very things are repudiated as visionary. A league of nations may be impracticable; it may be impossible of immediate realization. But the effort should be made by thinking men. The moral appeal of the President to the world is strong, and yet in this country the big moral principle, that new ethical code that he proclaims to the world, is ridiculed as nebulous and absurd.

What remains? There remains a war that has been won by the armies and the navies, not by the people. The people have been fighting for disarmament. They can not get that. The statesmen say it is not worth while. The people have been fighting for a world federation. The statesmen say it is not worth while—that it is a joke; that it is not worth trying. There is a lack of a definite international policy. There is a lack of support for the President who speaks in behalf of the people. He has plenty of difficulties over there. The secret treaties, the existence of which has heretofore been patriotically denied, are now made the basis of conflicting claims.

The old-style statesmanship is bankrupt.

The Washington Post credits Sir Arthur Balfour, foreign secretary of Great Britain, with the statement that pacts entered into by the nations will not be affected by the constitution of the league of nations. In other words, all the sinister schemes involving the spoliation of territory, secret treaties—treaties to which neither the people nor the Government of the United States was a party—will stand, in spite of the league of nations.

They may give you a new phrase; they may make you a "mandatory." [Laughter.] They may give you some new expression; but the substance of what the people of the world, the common masses, think the league of nations should be, the people are not going to get. That is why there is fear; that is why there is restlessness. The sum and substance of my complaint is that we have had no definite international policy heretofore, and that we have no definite international policy to-day; that we are drifting; that we do not know "where we are at." That is the sum and substance of my complaint. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, as nearly as I can make out, the complaint of my Socialist friend from New York is that the world has not repealed the law of human nature. I had not expected that to occur. The discussions of the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs on this floor rather disclosed the fact that that imaginary happening is not expected to be a fact, because he said we need the enactment of this naval program, which, I may say, is the largest in the history of the world, because we want to go into the league of nations with a bigger stick than anybody else has who comes into the league. [Laughter.]

That is a very commendable thing, of course, to go in with a better army than the other folks. Naturally Great Britain cherishes the same desire; likewise Italy and France.

Now, I do not want to pay any respects to the Kaiser nor to Hindenburg nor to Bernhardt, but if I read Bernhardt's book "The Next War" intelligently, he was in entire accord with the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs; that is, that force eventually determines the course of nations.

But I did not rise to talk about that phase of the naval appropriation bill. I have been under no delusion. All these phrases and nebulous speeches here and elsewhere have not deceived me. I have known all the while that human nature is just now what it has always been, and will probably remain so until the end of time. Nor do I sympathize with the defense of the President by the Socialist Member from New York. I know he is an internationalist. I am an American. [Applause.]

I am a selfish American. I believe in my country, and I want to promote its prosperity and its glory. I say with the poet:

This is my own, my native land.

And all of this international, socialistic, maudlin sentiment that is being propagated over the world is childish and academic. It is the spawn of those philosophers who learn human nature on the fifth story and not of those who have learned it from flesh-and-blood men. The point I want to inquire about is this: Who knows where we are going to get all the money to respond to all these cablegrams and all of these schemes and chimerical propositions for the uplift of mankind? Every Cabinet minister is busy with pencil and pad of paper showing how he could spend hundreds of millions of dollars to raise mankind to a state of bliss, and the head of every department and every committee is working overtime devising ways and means to spend sums of money which less than a decade ago were regarded as colossal expenditures. Now it is the building of homes for the poor. Now it is the purchase of lands for the homeless. Now it is railroads. Now it is telephones. Now it is an expenditure for the Navy of the United States which, I am told, exceeds the expenditure of Germany, England, and France for almost a decade before the war. Where are all these billions and billions coming from? Now, let me tell you. I understand every eleventh man in the United States pays an income tax. I am reliably informed that that is practically the entire source of our income, looking to the future. We will have no more whisky tax; we will have no great tariff tax of consequence, for it has dropped to \$150,000,000 in the last fiscal year. I am told you are going to get it by the income tax. That is where you will get the money to build this Navy. Now, my friends, there are many hard-headed business men here, and I submit to you gentlemen you must do your own thinking about this question. Where are you going to get the billions to do these numerous things? I believe we have a per capita circulation of about \$55. That would make a total of \$5,500,000,000. But what is \$5,500,000,000 considering the activities of the Government of the United States? Are you going to take every dollar there is in the United States out of the pockets of the people every six months? Why, you ought at least to allow it to go back into their pockets again and let them feel of it three or four times before you take it away again. [Laughter and applause.]

Now, here is what you are going to do: You take an income tax from every eleventh man, and you buy a little boat or a little railroad, or build a little house for the poor, or something else, and the other 10 fellows say, "That looks to me like pretty good business." Of course the eleventh fellow feels badly about it; but naturally, as long as these incomes hold out, you are going to have every sort of paternalistic suggestion. You are going to have socialistic doctrines and Government ownership preached from every rostrum. You are going to have attic philosophers telling the people that they ought to be supported by the Government; but is that all you are going to do? Oh, no. The day is coming, and it is not going to be long in coming at the rate we are traveling, when you will milk the incomes of the United States dry. Every man with the brain and the brawn and the will to work 12 or 14 hours a day to build a fortune will be driven out of business, and you will destroy the initiative of the American spirit which has builded up this great Nation of a hundred million people, the wealthiest in the world. Gentlemen do not earn incomes merely to have them taken from them by some dreamer of internationalism to build houses for some lazy fellows who will not work enough and save enough to build their own houses. [Applause.] Mr. Chairman, I have inquired diligently now for several months for somebody who says this Government and this people are able to carry on these colossal undertakings and bear these colossal burdens. You go to the chairman of the committee and ask him in vain. He does not know who in this Republic says that we can carry on these colossal undertakings and inflict upon the business of this country these tremendous taxes and not bring to the people of this country the greatest panic the world has ever seen. We are inflating the currency in order to get more money so that we can tax more money from the people, and the result is that inflation means high prices of the things that folks eat and the things that folks wear. Have a care! You have used up largely the accumulated wealth of Europe by absorbing their securities. You have placed a colossal mortgage upon the future of the destiny and the property of the people of the United States. You have done that, and you have spent the money, but you can not keep on writing these first, second, third, fourth, and fifth mortgages

against the property of this country. The people of the United States might as well face the question.

After all these academic speeches over the world it requires as much labor now to produce steak and pork chops and eggs and food generally and clothing generally as it did before this war began. So when you get right back to the proposition, we might just as well tell the folks that these appropriations have got to stop, or that you are going to stop business, because you will make it worthless to the man who engages in business. Do you suppose any man wants to go out and engage in manufacturing enterprises or in farming operations, or in milling or mining, to make an income, for no other purpose than to have some dreamy-eyed socialist suggest that it be spent to uplift mankind? I hope I am a bad prophet, but you are the body that under the Constitution is responsible for revenue legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. IGOE. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Texas be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. You are responsible, not the President in Paris; you under the Constitution as the coordinate branch of government are clothed by the Constitution with the power to originate revenue legislation. And every Member of this body has his own responsibility, and you ought to ask yourselves and give yourselves an intelligent answer. Where are the billions to come from to pay these colossal expenses? Mark you, gentlemen of this Congress, you are doing more than expending billions, you are teaching the American people a doctrine of paternalism that will curse them and their generations yet unborn in this country. If you only threw away and wasted and squandered the billions of money taken from taxation and business, if you only brought on industrial panic, the people could recover from that. Poverty and panic are not the worst things in the world, but you are spending billions taken from every eleventh man in a way to teach the American laboring man, the farmer, the railroad owner and the telephone owner, that the Government owes them a duty to support them and to lend them money and finance their operations and take charge of them.

The Government consists of nothing except the people in the aggregate. The Government is a pauper, has not a dollar except it taxes it from the people.

We see a strange tragedy here to-day—Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde. Dr. Jekyll demands the people to lend him money, and Mr. Hyde is telling the people that he is going to give them money to help them out of want and poverty. Dr. Jekyll says to the people of the United States, "Buy liberty bonds and war-saving stamps, and if you do not you will have to sign a yellow card that you are not a true patriot." And Mr. Hyde says, "We are going to build homes for the farmer, buy railroads, telephones," and so forth. Wonderful consistency! Do you know we need two political parties in this country, Mr. Chairman? We need one party that stands for the Constitution and liberty by law; that stands for America and for representative democracy and for a conservative Government. Let the radicals get to themselves. The misery of this situation is, the pitiful tragedy of politics in America to-day is, that we have two political parties vying with each other as to which can offer the most to the radical vote and get it in the largest quantity. [Applause.] The Republicans proceed to enact radical legislation, and we Democrats go you one better and advocate more radical legislation. [Applause.] There comes a time in this country, with bills like this, where we appropriate money that no sensible man knows where it comes from, bills threatening the industrial safety of this Republic. You have to have a conservative party to run the Government and hold in check the radical party.

Mr. Chairman, I wish some voice might cry out in the wilderness to tell the people of this country that it is their duty to support the Government and not the Government's duty to support them. The first two fundamental principles of government, and they are worth more than all the balance combined, are the protection of life and the protection of property. If there is no protection of property protection of life is worthless, because, in the language of the Merchant of Venice, "you may as well take my life as to take the means whereby I do sustain it."

They have more liberty in socialistic Russia to-day than they know what to do with. [Laughter and applause.] A man can absolutely yell at the top of his voice in a meeting house; he can shoot; he can do anything on earth except to retire to his

home castle and say "This is my citadel and I and my wife and children are safe." He can not do that. He can do anything on earth in Russia except to make a crop with the assurance that he can gather his own crop. He has all the liberty that a wild ass on the prairie has [laughter and applause] without the mule's security. [Laughter.]

What we need in this country is for the laboring man, the farmer, the banker, the people of the United States, to return to the old-time religion of Lincoln, of Jefferson, of Grover Cleveland, and the democracy of the country. Why do we not tell the people honestly and fairly that it is none of the Government's business whether they have a farm or not, it is the business of the individual to depend on himself. [Applause.] Do you know we are binding the hands and the arms of the people to their sides by the socialistic enactments. If you want a man's arm to wither, bind it by his side and give him no use of it. I think the most hateful doctrine in the world is the doctrine of socialism. I had rather have anarchy than socialism, because you recover from it more quickly. Anarchy is a good deal like a violent attack of pneumonia—the crisis may pass in three or four days; but socialism is the galloping consumption of the Nation [laughter and applause], where you linger and languish and perish away. I would say to the people who advocate socialistic legislation to rise a little earlier; if you are a farmer, save fertilizer more diligently; if you are an artisan, learn to have a little saving laid by, because depending on the Government will never get you into competency. That about completes what I have to say.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. BURNETT. In view of the very able speech of my colleague, is he going to vote for this three-year proposition?

Mr. DIES. Why, no; I already have all upon my conscience that I care to carry with me out into the security of private life when I retire from Congress. [Prolonged applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent, Navy: For all emergencies and extraordinary expenses, exclusive of personal services in the Navy Department, or any of its subordinate bureaus or offices at Washington, D. C., arising at home or abroad, but impossible to be anticipated or classified, to be expended on the approval and authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and for such purposes as he may deem proper, \$150,000.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RANDALL: Page 4, line 10, after the figures "\$150,000," insert—

"Provided, That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, required to furnish the adjutant general of each State, or to the officer thereof exercising corresponding functions, after requisition therefor, the names, home addresses, and rank attained and the date and reason for termination of service of the men of such States who served in the United States Navy or Marine Corps during the war between the United States and the Imperial German Government."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will not make the point of order. I appreciate the fact that it is subject to a point of order, but the object of the amendment is to enable the communities, the various cities in the States of this country, to secure the names of the men who served from the various local communities in the present war. A similar amendment, if this be permitted, will be offered to the Army bill. It requires no particular expense, but makes it possible for the local communities in the States to secure from their own adjutant general the honor roll of their own communities.

Mr. MCKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. Yes.

Mr. MCKEOWN. I will state to the gentleman that the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma has passed a resolution requesting this same matter in reference to the Army and Navy.

Mr. RANDALL. I am informed by the chairman of the committee that these States can get this information at the present time, but I desire to say that the only information that can be secured is the names of the men who enlisted from the State, but not their home addresses or any information of a local character.

Mr. GARD. Are not those facts known in the several States?

Mr. RANDALL. They are known so far as the draft lists are concerned, but volunteers often enlist from points outside of the State.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the gentleman taken pains to ascertain what additional cost this will entail, if the department undertakes it at the present time?

Mr. RANDALL. I will say to the gentleman that I understand there is a great surplus of clerks in the War Department at the present time. There would not be any extra expense incurred in connection with it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has stated that it is his understanding that there is a surplus of clerks in the War Department. In the preparation of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill The Adjutant General appeared before the subcommittee having that bill in charge and stated that he himself would need \$3,000,000 alone for clerical work in his bureau to do the work that has been planned, which he regards as pressingly needed.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDALL. Yes.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman advise us what is the condition with respect to the Navy, whether their clerical force is overworked or underworked?

Mr. STAFFORD. As to the Navy, though I have not heard the chairman of the committee mention what action they have taken upon it, it was suggested that if they were permitted they would continue during the next fiscal year the employment of yeomen and yeowomen in clerical positions, and still they would not have a sufficient force unless we authorized them to employ more than provided on their statutory roll. We allowed them a lump-sum appropriation of over \$1,000,000, distributed to the various bureaus for clerical services in these respective bureaus, and that was predicated somewhat upon the idea that they would continue a large contingent of yeomen and yeowomen in the service next year. They testified that they were going to go before the Naval Affairs Committee and ask for an authorization for the utilization of yeomen and yeowomen for the next fiscal year. Whether the committee has seen fit to grant that, I do not know.

Mr. PADGETT. The committee has not granted it; and on the declaration of peace the yeomen and yeowomen will go out.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to compliment the committee on taking that position.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that his time be extended for three minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not think we would be justified in continuing in the service, when the war is at an end, the yeomen and yeowomen for clerical positions when there are plenty of clerks to be obtained to fill those positions from the civil-service register.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the department tells me that under this bill they are going to be exceedingly pressed for clerical help. They are claiming that they will not have help enough to do the work that will devolve upon them. This would necessitate a good deal of extra work and considerable expense. I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Aviation, Navy: For aviation, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for procuring, producing, constructing, operating, preserving, storing, and handling aircraft, establishment and maintenance of aircraft stations, including the acquisition of land by purchase, donation, or condemnation for erection of a factory for lighter-than-air machines; and for experimental work in development of aviation for naval purposes, \$25,000,000: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for drafting, clerical, inspection, and messenger service for aircraft stations shall not exceed \$300,000: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay out of this appropriation the amounts due on claims for damages which have occurred or may occur to private property growing out of the operations of naval aircraft: *And provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for maintenance of more than six heavier-than-air stations on the coasts of continental United States.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the language on page 4, line 25—

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order has been reserved which will have to be first disposed of before amendments may be offered. Does the gentleman insist upon the point of order?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, what is the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserved the point of order partly to obtain information about some new phraseology. I wish first, however, to ascertain what is the purpose of providing \$25,000,000 for aviation purposes for the Navy, now that the war is at an end. I think some explanation should be made

of that tremendous amount which it is suggested shall be appropriated for the Navy for that purpose in peace times.

Mr. PADGETT. The original appropriation submitted was for \$225,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. That was based, if the gentleman will permit, on the idea that we were to continue in the war?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I understand. Now, I will give the gentleman the history of it. When the bureau chiefs came before us they set forth in the hearings the demand and necessity as they estimated for \$85,000,000, and the Secretary of the Navy in his hearing arbitrarily reduced that to \$36,000,000. The committee in considering it has reduced it to \$25,000,000. I want to say to the gentleman that I doubt very much if \$25,000,000 will carry on the activities of the Navy with reference to the ships and the limited number of shore stations. We put in a proviso there limiting the shore stations to not exceed six in the continental limits of the United States. Now, I have a letter here from the Secretary to which I desire to call your attention. He says:

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 11, 1919.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 10th instant, in which you request that the committee be furnished with a full and detailed statement of the items, the usages, and purposes for which the \$36,000,000 is desired in the item "Aviation—Navy," as it appears on page 11 of the first draft of the naval appropriation bill.

The following is a detailed statement of the estimate of expenditures covering the \$36,000,000 recommended:

Aircraft (heavier than air):	
Machines for experimenting and development purposes	\$3,774,000
Engines for above	2,338,000
	6,112,000
Aircraft (lighter than air):	
Craft for operation of stations now built	\$2,005,000
Craft for experimenting and development purposes	7,500,000
Engines for above	701,000
	10,206,000
For development of instruments and accessories, including radio sets and kite-balloon winches	
	650,000
Operation of coastal and training stations already built	8,500,000
Experimental work not otherwise covered (such as Argon gas and landing attachments aboard ship)	2,000,000
Large rigid dirigible construction, experimental and development station	8,200,000
Clerical, drafting, and technical force	300,000
	19,650,000
Total	35,968,000
Estimate	36,000,000

It will be noted from the above statement that there is no estimate for new coastal stations, except a new station for a rigid-dirigible factory. It is impossible to construct a rigid-dirigible factory near the present heavier-than-air factory in the Philadelphia Navy Yard because of lack of space.

A larger appropriation for lighter-than-air aircraft is requested because in this respect Navy aviation is not as far developed as in the heavier-than-air aircraft.

The development of aviation and progress of the art is such that it is strongly recommended that the appropriation be made in a lump sum, as recommended, so that the department may experiment and develop aviation along lines that from time to time may seem most advantageous to the naval service.

Inclosed you will please find a copy of a report on aviation by Admiral Mayo, commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet, and particular attention is invited to the concluding paragraph wherein he cites the experiments and development in the rigid-dirigible type of aircraft of other countries.

Very sincerely, yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

Hon. L. P. PADGETT,
Chairman Committee on Naval Affairs,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

UNITED STATES ATLANTIC FLEET,
U. S. S. PENNSYLVANIA, FLAGSHIP,
November 23, 1918.

From: Commander in Chief.

To: Secretary of the Navy (Operations).

Subject: Report on development of rigid and nonrigid airships and plans for future developments (British Navy).

1. The failure of the Zeppelins in the raids over Great Britain and the destruction of several Zeppelins over the North Sea by planes carried on cruisers, and on one occasion by a large American flying boat, has induced the belief in the minds of many officers that the lighter-than-air ship has been definitely displaced by the heavier-than-air machines.

2. Those officers who have had most to do with the lighter-than-air type contend that the destruction of Zeppelins in raids does not prove that these ships are not valuable for other purposes. They contend that Zeppelins (of the type of those destroyed) should not have been used for raiding, as, due to their small capacity, they could not climb high enough to avoid antiaircraft guns or fighting planes, and, due to the inflammable gas (hydrogen) with which the bags were filled, they were helpless against attack.

3. The improvements in lighter-than-air ship design have been such that the latest German rigid airship has a speed of about 70 to 80 miles per hour, a ceiling of 24,000 feet, and a rate of climb superior to any plane. With these characteristics a rigid is comparatively safe against attack from antiaircraft guns or heavier-than-air machines. Additional safety has been assured to the lighter-than-air ship by the development of a noninflammable gas (helium), of which the United States possesses almost limitless natural resources.

4. The airship's chief value in naval warfare is in scouting and in keeping large areas of sea under observation. This work may be divided into two general classes:

(a) Antisubmarine and convoy-escort work.

(b) Work in scouting in conjunction with the fleets.

5. Much work of class (a) has already been done by nonrigid airships in Great Britain and in the United States. The nonrigid type of airship is not suitable for any activities where it is subject to attack by airplanes, for the construction features of this type prevent building airships of a size large enough to obtain sufficient speed, ceiling, or climbing ability. Nonrigid airships can never have a sufficient radius of action to make them satisfactory for distant scouting. The latest British nonrigid airships are probably nearly as efficient as any future design of that type for the performance of the tasks which this type is fitted to perform.

6. For work of class (a), where enemy planes or antiaircraft guns may be encountered, and for work of class (b) the rigid type of airship is essential to the highest efficiency.

DEVELOPMENT OF HEAVIER-THAN-AIR AND LIGHTER-THAN-AIR CRAFT DURING THE LAST FOUR YEARS.

7. The development of rigid airships has been even more rapid than that of heavier than air. In 1914 the average endurance of a German rigid at cruising speed was under 24 hours and the maximum full speed about 50 miles per hour. In 1918 (German L-70 class, 2,195,000 cubic feet capacity) the endurance at 45 miles per hour has risen to 177.5 hours and the maximum full speed to 77 miles per hour. The ceiling has correspondingly increased from 6,000 feet to 23,000 feet. The British R-38 class (2,720,000 cubic feet capacity) has an estimated cruising endurance at 45 miles per hour of 211 hours, 34 hours greater than the German L-70 class.

8. Tables (1) and (2) give the progress in lighter than air and heavier than air since 1914. Table (3) shows the difference in performance between corresponding lighter-than-air and heavier-than-air craft of 1918.

TABLE 1.—Lighter than air.

	August, 1914.	August, 1918.	Progress.
			Per cent.
Maximum speed	50 m. p. h.	77.6 m. p. h.	55
Endurance at 45 miles per hour	20 hours	177.5 hours	787.5
Total lift	30 tons	66.64 tons	122
Disposable lift	8.5 tons	38.84 tons	357
Efficiency ratio	27.3 per cent.	58.3 per cent.	113.5
Static ceiling	6,000 feet	21,000 feet	250
Indicated horsepower	800	2,100	162.5

TABLE 2.—Heavier than air.

	August, 1914.	August, 1918.	Progress.
			Per cent.
Speed	83 m. p. h.	85 m. p. h.	2.4
Endurance	4 hours	12.5 hours	212.5
Total weight, loaded	0.737 ton	5.97 tons	524
Useful load	0.268 ton	2.17 tons	709
Efficiency ratio	36.3 per cent.	36.4 per cent.	28
Ceiling	14,000 feet	15,000 feet	7.1
Indicated horsepower	80	720	800

TABLE 3.—Heavier than air and lighter than air.

August, 1918.	Heavier than air.	Lighter than air.	Comparison.	
			Heavier than air.	Lighter than air.
			Per cent.	Per cent.
Speed	85 miles per hour	77.6 miles per hour	9.5	
Cruising endurance	18.8 hours	177.5 hours		844
Total lift (— weight loaded)	5.97 tons	66.64 tons		1017
Disposable lift (— useful load)	2.17 tons	38.84 tons		1089
Efficiency ratio	36.4 per cent.	58.3 per cent.		60.2
Ceiling	15,000 feet	21,000 feet		40
Indicated horsepower	720	2,100		191.7

9. It will be seen that at the present time the largest rigids in commission have over eleven times the total lift of the corresponding heavier than air, and that the disposable lift is about eighteen times greater.

LARGE AIRSHIPS PROBABLE FUTURE DEVELOPMENT.

10. It is now proposed to consider more fully the possibilities of the large airship. Table 5 shows the approximate dimensions of a series of airships similar in form to British R-33.

TABLE 5.—Approximate dimensions of airships similar in form to British R-33.

Capacity.	Gross lift.	Length.	Diameter.
		Fed.	Fed.
2,000,000	60.7	643	79
3,000,000	91.1	736	90.4
4,000,000	121.4	810	99.5
5,000,000	151.8	872	107.2
6,000,000	182.2	927	113.9
7,000,000	212.5	976	119.9
8,000,000	242.8	1,021	125.4
9,000,000	272.3	1,061	130.4
10,000,000	303.6	1,100	135.1

11. It will be seen that although a 10,000,000 cubic feet capacity rigid has five times the gross lift and over five times the disposable lift of the present 2,000,000 cubic feet capacity rigid, the dimensions of the large ship are only one and seven-tenths times greater.

12. With a rigid of about 10,000,000 cubic feet capacity there would be an endurance of approximately three weeks at 40 to 45 miles per hour, a maximum speed of 70 to 80 miles per hour, a ceiling of some 30,000 feet, and a maximum range of over 20,000 miles, or nearly once around the world.

PAST BRITISH POLICY.

13. Great Britain first appears to have recognized the danger of falling behind in airships in July, 1913, as the following extract from Admiralty policy on the subject will show:

"Various circumstances have since arisen which have led my lords to view with considerable concern the position occupied by this country, and after full consideration they have decided that it is no longer possible to pursue a waiting policy, having regard to the safety of the country."

14. The new circumstances referred to may be briefly stated as follows:

"First. The success of the type of large airships possessed by Germany has been demonstrated by numerous flights of these vessels over sea and land. As an example, there may be quoted the case of the airship sighted on June 2 in the North Sea over the Terschelling Banks, proceeding with four torpedo-boat destroyers at full speed. These craft were again sighted 24 hours later. Also the regularity with which the passenger-carrying Zeppelins carry out extended flights lasting many hours over Germany indicates clearly how reliable these vessels are now becoming.

"Second. The introduction of the new German aerial bill, together with a supplementary estimate which provides for the establishment of a naval fleet of 10 Zeppelin airships and a number of hydroplanes, with full equipment of sheds, stores, personnel, etc. For carrying out this scheme a sum of £300,881 has been provided for the year 1913-14, exclusive of the cost of acquiring any land for the stations.

"The following extract of a memorandum accompanying the supplementary estimates indicates the view of the German Government: 'The present state of the experiments carried out with airships and aeroplanes show that the new weapon forms for naval purposes a valuable extension and adjunct to tactical and strategic scouting, and under certain circumstances can also be employed with advantage as a weapon of defense.'

"Italy already possesses several airships of a small type and is now pushing on with the construction of three larger vessels. It is understood that three airship stations are to be established along the Adriatic coast. Russia has recently placed an order for a large Parseval airship for naval purposes.

"The situation in this country with regard to naval airships is that the Admiralty are on the eve of possessing two airships of medium size, which were purchased mainly for the purpose of training officers and men in airship work. One airship station on the Medway is being established and two sheds are being erected there.

"My lords consider that, in view of the activity displayed by foreign powers, it is necessary to proceed at once on an expansion of this branch of the service."

15. Acting on the above, the Admiralty proceeded to develop airships, but the policy was finally checked by the then first lord (Mr. Winston Churchill), who, in January, 1915, canceled the building of rigid airships and ordered No. 9 (building at Vickers) to be suspended. Mr. Churchill indicated that three Parsevals, two Astra Torres, and the few other odd nonrigids of no military value would suffice the country's needs. In July, 1915, Mr. Balfour championed the cause of airships, ordered No. 9 to be re-commenced and other rigids to be built, and laid the foundation for the present constructional organization.

PRESENT BRITISH POLICY.

16. While the British Admiralty airship department has made no statement concerning a definite policy in the uses of the rigid airships that are being developed for British use, it appears that regular voyages of startling length are planned for these craft. A mail and cargo service connecting the British Isles, Canada, the British colonies in Africa, India, and Australia appears to be the goal of the Admiralty policy. Surely such work is entirely within the scope of the air fleet that Britain is preparing.

17. In time of war these airships can be concentrated over any area of the seas surrounding English possessions to hamper hostile surface craft and to assist the Navy in its operations.

GERMANY'S AIRSHIP PROGRAM.

18. The results already attained have justified the confidence felt by the German Navy in its airships when used in their proper sphere as the eyes of the fleet. Their Zeppelins did much to save the High Seas Fleet at the Battle of Jutland, to save their cruiser squadron on the Yarmouth raid, and were instrumental in sinking the *Nottingham* and *Falmouth*. Had the positions been reversed in the Jutland battle and had the British had rigids to enable them to locate it, they would probably have annihilated the German High Seas Fleet.

AIRSHIPS.

19. At the present time Germany possesses apparently 50 efficient rigid airships built since 1915, in addition to a few nonrigids which she uses only for training purposes.

20. The Schutte-Lenz works, which build rigid airships, take about 12 weeks to build each ship. The maximum output of their factories is 1 ship every 16 days. Germany's total output of rigid airships would therefore appear to be 30 rigids a year, or 1 every 12 days.

SHEDS.

21. The latest information shows that Germany has 54 housing and constructional sheds, capable of holding 71 rigid airships. This surplus of shed accommodation, placed all over the country, enables ships which can not get to their base after a long cruise to make for vacant berths where the weather conditions are more favorable.

BRITISH RIGID AIRSHIPS.

22. While no other nation has done as well as the Germans in rigid airships, the British, alive to the need of maintaining sea supremacy, are closely competing. A few days ago they held acceptance trials of a 1,400,000 cubic foot ship (the *R-31*), which made over 55 knots and could lift 18 tons (or, say, 200 persons).

23. This ship turned in a complete circle of 0.7 mile diameter in three minutes. Another British ship now under way (*R-35*) will have a displacement of 2,750,000 cubic feet, a speed of about 70 knots, and a range of well over 200 hours, or safely across the Atlantic and return in any weathers except the worst storms.

24. The British, who, despite having shot down so many bombing Zeppelins, are keenly aware of their utility, are embarked upon a construction program of 16 of modern type (besides smaller, now obsolete, types already in commission and used for training); the French have a similar program, calling for 8; it is understood the Italians are to construct 2; and our joint Army and Navy rigid-airship board has recommended that we begin with 4 for the Navy.

CONCLUSION.

25. The development of the nonrigid airship is practically at a standstill, while the development of the rigid type is being pushed by Germany, France, and Great Britain. The future of the rigid airship depends upon the ability of its designers to secure for it a superiority, relative to heavier-than-air craft, in radius, ceiling, climbing ability, and an approximation to the speed of the fighting planes.

H. T. MAYO.

Mr. STAFFORD. How did the committee arrive at the appropriation of \$25,000,000?

Mr. PADGETT. The committee reduced it to \$25,000,000; but you will notice that we put in a provision that no part of this appropriation shall be expended for maintenance of more than six heavier-than-air stations in the continental limits of the United States. That would limit the scope of the operations for air stations. I think there are some 12 or 15 stations being operated now.

Mr. STAFFORD. In arriving at that estimate of \$25,000,000, what items did the committee include and what items did the committee eliminate?

Mr. PADGETT. We did not eliminate any specifically. We reduced it to \$25,000,000 and put that provision here, and it will necessarily limit the activities of the Government in aircraft.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the committee considered, in arriving at this appropriation, the expediency of the Navy obtaining motors and flying machines from the War Department, where they have a large number in excess of their needs?

Mr. PADGETT. That matter was presented; but if the War Department were to furnish them the Navy Department would have to compensate the War Department for them, and the War Department would turn the money into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the committee considered the feasibility of having them transferred from the War Department to the Navy Department?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; we did not, because we did not know how the War Department is situated with reference to them.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I will.

Mr. SNELL. Must not they have a large amount on hand at the present time of these of all kinds?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know; but the engines of the Navy are in some respects different from the Army engines.

Mr. SNELL. I would like also to ask in reference to the acquisition of land. What land is it contemplated purchasing now?

Mr. PADGETT. The only thing contemplated is securing land for the erection of a factory for the construction of lighter-than-air machines—the large dirigible machines.

Mr. SNELL. Does not the Government own some automobile factories in this country at the present time?

Mr. PADGETT. None of which I know.

Mr. SNELL. I thought they had furnished money or had a very large interest in some of them?

Mr. PADGETT. We made a very full inquiry and they told us the Government had no place for investigating—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PADGETT. We have a large station in Florida, and I think there are about 1,100 acres in that navy yard, and we have there a large factory for the construction of heavier-than-air machines.

Mr. SNELL. Could not these lighter-than-air machines be constructed in the same factory?

Mr. PADGETT. No; they said not; but it requires a large area to bring these machines down. They are tremendous machines. They are about 800 or 900 feet long.

Mr. SNELL. Then, the Government has no real monetary interest in several of the large factories where they have been producing?

Mr. PADGETT. None that I know of. We inquired very diligently if there was any place that the Government had where they could use for these lighter-than-air machines and they said positively no.

Mr. SNELL. And they have not any of these machines at present?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir.

Mr. SNELL. This is an entirely new development?

Mr. PADGETT. It is entirely experimental. Now, I have here, which the Secretary transmitted, a letter from Admiral Mayo, who is commander in chief of the Atlantic Fleet, in which he gives a summary or a review of the heavier-than-air and lighter-than-air development abroad and our shortage of the lighter-than-air and the need of developing, experimental generally, in the United States.

Mr. STAFFORD. How many lighter-than-air machines has the Navy at the present time, and how many are in course of construction?

Mr. PADGETT. None.

Mr. STAFFORD. What was this large airship that passed over Washington on its way from New York down to the coast a few Sundays ago.

Mr. PADGETT. They have some kite balloons and some semidirigibles, but nothing of the type that is contemplated here.

Mr. STAFFORD. How many of these semidirigibles have they in operation and how many in course of construction?

Mr. PADGETT. I could not tell the gentleman; that is not contemplated in this. They had some few of them; I think some 8 or 10 of them.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCKENZIE. The gentleman from Tennessee has been for many years a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Fortunately or unfortunately for a number of years I have been a member of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House.

Mr. PADGETT. I think that was the good fortune of the committee.

Mr. MCKENZIE. I listened to the reading of the letter a few moments ago which the chairman received from the Secretary of the Navy, and among the items, as I remember, there was something like \$2,000,000 that was to be used in experimenting with argon gas and different kinds of balloons and different types of aircraft. Now, I am calling the gentleman's attention to that for this reason, that pending in the Committee on Military Affairs is the regular annual appropriation bill, and one of the items asked for in that bill is \$10,000,000 by the Aircraft Board to be used for experimental purposes, and among the things with which they expect to experiment is this same character of gas and also the development of aircraft machines. Now, I want to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he does not think that we have about reached the point when the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Committee on Military Affairs of the House of Representatives should have some defined policy whereby these activities would be centralized, and not have two or three great concerns experimenting with the same sort of thing—for instance, gas? Is there any reason that can be given why we should appropriate a large sum of money to the Navy to experiment with a certain type of gas and another large sum to the Army to experiment along the same line?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] has again expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve the point of order further for the purpose of inquiring—

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I would like recognition in my own right in order to answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman. Of course, the point of order is pending.

Mr. PADGETT. I understand that.

The CHAIRMAN. Or, rather, the point of order is reserved. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the chairman, in his time, reply to the query propounded by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCKENZIE].

Mr. PADGETT. I was going to state that you could pick out certain definite proposals or propositions where it would be well to combine them and have only one. But when we were abroad we talked with the officers of the Army in England, where they have combined the aviation activities of the Navy and the Army, about this matter, and they did not approve it. They disapproved it, and said it was not working satisfactorily. And we also talked with some naval officers, and they stated that it was not satisfactory.

Mr. MCKENZIE. If the gentleman will pardon me, I think it will go without any argument that the officers in both of these Government activities would say that it would be a mis-

take. But I have the taxpayer in mind. Would it be a mistake from the taxpayer's standpoint?

Mr. PADGETT. The activities of the Navy in aviation are very different from the activities of the Army. This \$2,000,000 that you mentioned here is, a part of it, for gas, but a great deal of it, the majority part of it, is for the development of the means of alighting on the water, alighting on the ship and off of the ship, and to develop the activities in aviation adapted to the ship, on and off. And that is one of the big items that they wish to develop. It is a very important one. It was also suggested to the committee that provision should be made for the construction of aircraft ships, in order to carry aircraft to be used in scouting in mid-ocean, and also that provision should be made to have aircraft actually on the fighting ships, so as to go along with the fleets. These matters are questions of experiment and development that the Navy alone could successfully conduct.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. What about the gas? What is the Navy going to spend this money for?

Mr. PADGETT. They did not separate the item as to how much of it was for experimenting with the gas and how much of it is for the other. But in order to cut the whole thing down we took off \$11,000,000 of the estimate of the Secretary, so as to limit the activities along all of those lines. He wanted \$36,000,000. We reduced it to \$25,000,000.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Is this experiment to be made in the manufacture and discovery of new gases?

Mr. PADGETT. We have already discovered a new gas, called argon.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Possibly they have not reached the last stage yet.

Mr. PADGETT. No; and this is for the development of it. When it was first discovered it was supposed to be so costly as to be prohibitive. They have so far developed it that when you consider the durability of it as compared with hydrogen there is very little difference now in the cost between the argon gas and the hydrogen gas.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The point on which I was anxious to get the information was whether this money is to be spent by the Navy in an attempt to develop new gases or in experiments in its application? I mean by "application" its application to the enemy.

Mr. PADGETT. It is to develop the production of it the most economically, which has already been accomplished largely, but not satisfactorily as yet. It is to experiment and develop its best uses and the handling of it and the manufacture of it, and also for the use of it and the development of it practically in the Navy.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Well, we have a Chemical Warfare Service in the Army which devotes its activities entirely and exclusively to that matter. Does the gentleman think the Navy ought to go along and do the same thing?

Mr. PADGETT. I think the Navy ought to try it. Otherwise, the Navy would be ignorant of the uses and practical application of it.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. I can not see why. The Chemical Warfare Service is not keeping it a secret.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Just a moment more. The Chemical Warfare Service will not keep secret from the Navy anything they discover, and they are really the people who are going to apply it at last in 99 per cent of the cases where it is applied. Now, it has occurred to me that it is proposed, in fact, to have the Army do it and the Navy do it, when, I suppose, as a matter of fact, some civil bureau in the Government is going to substantially do the work for either the Army or the Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. The gas part of it is but a small part.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It depends entirely on what the gentleman means by small.

Mr. STAFFORD. Only \$2,000,000.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. That is small.

Mr. STAFFORD. Small in the view of the naval propagandists.

Mr. PADGETT. Landing attachments aboard ship. That is embraced in there with the gas, and that is a large part of the expenditure.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman acquaint the House with the amount of the expenditure by the Navy for aviation expenses during the last year, or up to date?

Mr. PADGETT. I can not tell about that, but the appropriation was \$220,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes; and the appropriation the year before was three and a half millions; and now you are asking for \$25,000,000, and yet the committee has no information to give us as to the amount expended out of this \$220,000,000 lump-sum appropriation.

Mr. PADGETT. It has not been expended yet. It was only started the 1st of July, the gentleman should remember.

Mr. STAFFORD. It is still running and available, and you can be sure that they are going to spend a large portion of it, because it was only \$3,500,000 in the beginning, and now it has been increased to \$25,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. They have been economical.

Mr. STAFFORD. You should say liberal.

Mr. PADGETT. I did not think that we ought to have a larger amount. The committee thought we ought not to cripple the aviation service, but that we ought to go ahead and develop it and utilize the lessons we learned from it.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that new language found on line 25, page 4, and on lines 1 and 2, on page 5, "including the acquisition of land by purchase, donation, or condemnation for erection of a factory for lighter-than-air machines."

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, that was a site that was covered.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LA GUARDIA: Page 5, line 3, strike out "\$25,000,000" and insert "\$15,000,000."

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, there is no use in going into details on this item. We are talking about \$25,000,000 or \$30,000,000, and there are less than 25 or 30 Members in this Hall.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is about a \$1,000,000 apiece.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Has the gentleman from New York any information on this subject that the Committee on Naval Affairs could not give us, even if the House were full?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Certainly, and plenty of it. I have a lot of information which I think, if we had a full House here, would be very valuable. We are asked to appropriate \$25,000,000, and yet we are unable to ascertain just how this money is to be expended.

In reply to an inquiry, the chairman of the committee reads a letter from the Secretary of the Navy explaining this \$25,000,000, and yet the Secretary has over \$200,000,000 for aviation available for the current fiscal year.

The trouble with American aviation, gentleman, is that it has had too much money. That was our whole mistake in the beginning. We started off with \$640,000,000, and I do not know how much was appropriated afterwards, and we have got less to show for it than any country in the world. And although we have the best industries, the best inventive genius in the world, we have not a motor to-day that will stand up with the French and Italian and English motors. The fact is you can not build aviation motors with press agents, and you can not build up an aviation service by politics. The law of gravitation knows no politics, and if you have not got a good machine it will not fly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman no doubt has read the address by Secretary Baker commending Col. Deeds for having perfected the Liberty motor?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Yes; and the Secretary in his report said the biggest achievement of the war was the Liberty motor. That is absolutely incorrect, and he can not get a single human being to agree with him.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is not consistent with the report made by Mr. Justice Hughes nor with the report of the Attorney General suggesting that Col. Deeds should be court-martialed.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. No; nor is it consistent to take this motor and compare it with other motors. It is a good 400-horsepower motor; that is all. But to produce this 400-horsepower motor you stopped the industries of the United States; you stopped everything; and when they discovered that they could not use the Liberty motor in pursuit machines they said: "We will not have pursuit machines."

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know that the gentleman knows all about aviation, and I knew he had read the address of the Secretary of War, and therefore I wanted to remind him of what the Secretary said in New York in commending Col. Deeds, although Mr. Justice Hughes and the Department of Justice had recommended that Col. Deeds be court-martialed.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Well, it is an Ohio baby. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It has had the approval of the Secretary of War.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. He comes from Ohio.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That inference might be drawn from what the gentleman said. Of course I would not assume from what the gentleman said that the Ohio interests were strong enough in the matter of an expenditure of \$640,000,000 to induce the Secretary of War, at variance with the Attorney General and Mr. Justice Hughes, to commend Col. Deeds in spite of the fact that he was recommended for court-martial.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Would the gentleman go further? Even now, in peace times, the gentleman will understand how they club and chum together, but in war times, when we were in need of pursuit machines, we could not get a single machine from here because no pursuit machine was being built in this country.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Our friends on the other side were telling us that the time had come when we were to have quite a number of them, although we were afterwards told that we did not have in France half a dozen battle planes of American manufacture.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. That was true. When the DH planes did come over they were good planes, and they did some bombing, but we did not receive any battle planes. Why? Because the Liberty motor would not fit them.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Are we to understand that Col. Deeds, who was recommended for court-martial by the Attorney General and Mr. Justice Hughes, and who is commended by the Secretary of War, is notwithstanding that fact a \$640,000,000 baby of the Secretary of War?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. If I told you what the airmen thought of it in August, September, and October, it would not be couched in parliamentary language, and could not be printed. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does not the gentleman from New York believe that the cherishing of Col. Deeds, who had under his control this \$640,000,000, was worth that much to the aviators of the country?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I should say not—rather expensive experiment that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Now, gentlemen, we want to build an air industry in this country. Most of this money, as the committee says, is for experimental purposes. The Army is going to come in with a bill in a few days asking for millions for experimental purposes. The services are overlapping in experimental work. We must prevent waste; we must cut down expenses. We will have waste as long as we go on duplicating work and expenditures. In want to say this for the naval air service: Its organization overseas was splendid. It had an efficient executive department. Their management was good. Their cooperation with this country was much better than ours in the Army. Now, the \$2,000,000 which is suggested by the chairman for experimental purposes, for landing and taking off from ships, ought to be allowed. That is now purely in an experimental stage. In answering an inquiry made a few minutes ago, I will say there is no difference between the motor for a machine that flies over water and one that flies over land. The air is just the same in both places. The best help we can give to aviation is not to squander millions. We must produce a true American motor, a true American plane. We can do it if you will give us a chance, but we will never do it when we have the Navy dabbling in it and the Army dabbling in it, and the Marine Corps dabbling in it and the Post Office Department dabbling in it.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Certainly.

Mr. McKEOWN. I have been told that the motors on naval planes were slower than the motors on the Army planes. Is that true?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. One of the motors of naval planes is a low-compression motor. All kinds of motors are used for naval planes, same as land planes. It comes back to the question of

the Liberty motor again. They wanted to utilize the Liberty motor for all machines. The big naval bombing machine, the coast-patrol machine, took the low-compression motor, because it was not necessary to go to such altitudes. Again, it was adapting the plane to the motor and not the motor to the plane. But when you have a light machine and do not need a 400-horsepower motor and want altitude and speed, why, of course, it will be just the same whether you fly over the land or over the water. The trouble is we are dividing this thing. We have four different departments overlapping. We took away \$2,000,000 from the Post Office Department the other day. We have all these people dabbling in this, instead of having a comprehensive united air department taking up this subject for the Government and accomplishing results and developing a big aeronautical industry in this country. I submit that the \$15,000,000, with what they have on hand, is amply sufficient, more than enough, considering Army appropriations. Of course, if you are going to buy fields all along the coast, if the main thing is to buy land, I do not know anything about land values. I know that we spent a lot of money for land down in Miami, Fla. The Florida people wanted an aviation station. They came up here with delegations asking for it, and now that they have got it they ask the Navy Department to take it away, because it disturbs the morning sleep of the guests at the hotels. Is the gentleman aware of that?

The Government spent thousands and thousands of dollars at the Miami station, and now the Miami people are asking the Navy Department to move away because it disturbs the sleep of their winter guests. So if you want to buy land come in here and say you want to buy land, but do not blame everything on aviation. If we take off \$10,000,000 and leave \$15,000,000 to develop aviation, divided up so much for planes, so much for motors, so much for experimental purposes, then we are going to have something; but as long as we appropriate lump sums we will never know where it will go and never accomplish anything for aviation. When the appropriation for that \$640,000,000 came into this House I was still young in my legislative career. I wanted to talk about it, but gentlemen said, "Don't! Disloyal to do so. Beware of the Germans. Don't say a word about it," and they got away with it. And what did we get out of the \$640,000,000? For every American machine that went over the lines into Germany it cost us more than it would have cost to build a super-dreadnaught. That is what we got out of it. Now, we might as well start on this bill. I am going to make similar amendments when the Army bill comes in. Until we have a united air service in charge of competent technical men we must watch aviation appropriations. Let us take the money away from them until they come to their senses. When they come to their senses they will have to come together, and we will have an air department the same as England and France have. They can put it all over us in the air, from either the commercial or the military standpoint. They have got it on us. We must hustle to even catch up with European countries. Gentlemen, I urge the adoption of my amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the committee have disposed of the question of land, and that is no longer involved.

The question was asked a moment ago, How much is unexpended of the appropriation of last year? I did not have the figures at the time, but on page 155 of the hearings you will find it stated that there would be \$90,000,000 returned to the Treasury out of the appropriation of the current year.

Mr. BUTLER. How much was appropriated?

Mr. PADGETT. Two hundred and twenty million dollars.

Mr. BUTLER. That gives them \$130,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. How was that \$130,000,000 spent?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know. That is for the current year, and we did not go into that.

Mr. STAFFORD. It was too small an amount for the committee to consider at the present time?

Mr. PADGETT. No; but that was the appropriation that had been already made, and we were going into the appropriation for the next year.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the committee might have followed the Committee on Appropriations in seeking to cancel some of the authorizations and to withdraw some of the appropriations that were voted for war purposes alone, now that the war is at an end.

Mr. PADGETT. I have discussed that question. The Committee on Appropriations have taken up that subject, and we left it with them. They did deal with the Navy appropriation, and re-covered into the Treasury something like \$200,000,000.

Mr. BROWNING. In the original print of the bill I have it marked that they have \$90,000,000 on hand. Do I understand

that they will still have that \$90,000,000 on hand, or did a part of it go back into the Treasury?

Mr. PADGETT. That \$90,000,000 will not be expended or obligated and will go back into the Treasury.

Mr. BROWNING. Is that included in the item of the appropriation bill which we have already passed, turning the money back?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not remember whether the appropriation bill included that or not, but it will go back into the Treasury and will not be expended. Now, this is an annual appropriation. The gentleman spoke of the money that we have on hand. We are appropriating for the fiscal year 1920. This appropriation that is now current is for the fiscal year 1919. It can not be used for 1920.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. If they start now, they can spend money up to July.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but this bill is from July next to the July following.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. What I mean is that you could get a lot of things started between now and July.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but if they start them, they would not have any money to complete them the next year. The committee was very careful about this. The committee applied the knife to it very severely and reduced it. I hope the motion will not prevail.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Is the gentleman absolutely sure, notwithstanding the fact that direct reference to the land has been stricken out, that money can not be spent for the purchase of land under this provision?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; because we have a provision in here that prohibits the purchase of land with the expenditure of any appropriation in the bill.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. I noticed in the paper this morning that \$4,000,000 had been paid for the purchase of land at Cape May. I wondered if that was being purchased out of the money now in the hands of the department.

Mr. PADGETT. No; I understand that it was out of the lump-sum appropriation for the President.

Mr. CONNELLY of Kansas. I am in favor of amending the bill so as to stop the purchase of land. One of the things that will appear unwise when a full investigation is had is the purchase of land during the war. Everybody in the country who had a piece of land that they wanted to unload on the Government was able to unload it on either the War Department or the Navy Department.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I understand that I am mistaken and that the prohibition I spoke of was to another matter.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. There was stricken from the paragraph the provision for the purchase of land for a lighter-than-air-machine station. I notice the gentleman has not decreased the appropriation. Was it not the intention of the committee that money was to be spent on that?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Why is it not reduced?

Mr. PADGETT. I was going to state that I was going to offer an amendment reducing it \$8,000,000, the amount appropriated for the purchase of land for a lighter-than-air-craft station.

Mr. TILSON. Then the gentleman from New York is not so far off when he moves to reduce it ten millions.

Mr. PADGETT. But the gentleman did not let me finish my statement.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Will the gentleman from Tennessee yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The authorization is still in the bill, to be expended by the Secretary of the Navy for the producing and constructing, etc., of aircraft. Can the gentleman tell me—I am entirely ignorant on the subject—how does the Navy produce and construct these aircraft without a factory?

Mr. PADGETT. They have a factory already built and operating, which was constructing aircraft during the war for heavier-than-air machines.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Then this will limit them to the operations of that factory?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Is there anything peculiar about naval aircraft except that which enables them to float on water?

Mr. PADGETT. There is a difference between the land machine and the water machine which the Navy uses. They used a machine with much less revolutions than does the machine for the Army.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The same engine that runs one would run the other?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but you would have to reduce the speed.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. But it can be done?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it can be done.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Does the gentleman think it necessary, that being true, for each department of the Government to have a separate factory? Does the gentleman think it is economical?

Mr. PADGETT. The Navy already has and is operating a factory. I do not know what the Army is doing with reference to the manufacture of machines, but the Navy expects in Philadelphia to be able to produce the aircraft machines it needs for the Navy.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It seems to me that it is an unfortunate situation that the Navy does not know what the Army is doing and the Army does not know what the Navy is doing, but the Treasury Department knows, or will in the last analysis, what they are both doing.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. What they are trying to do.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. How much did we appropriate last year for aircraft—a billion dollars?

Mr. TILSON. About one billion and a half dollars. That was the whole program and nearly five hundred million dollars has been covered into the Treasury.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. That leaves a billion already expended.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. That is only for the Army.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It occurs to me that they could use a factory and manufacture a machine that would run fast enough for the Army and one slow enough for the Navy. [Laughter.]

Mr. PADGETT. The Navy is manufacturing its machines.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. And I suppose the Post Office Department will manufacture its machines.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know what the Post Office Department intends to do.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. That is the trouble, no department knows what the other is doing.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I have always been a friend of aviation since Prof. Langley made his experiments. I still am a friend of aviation, and I hope also I may be a friend of the people of the United States. Here is an appropriation of \$25,000,000 carried in this bill for aviation purposes. That is as great an amount as was carried for the entire Navy—for the maintenance and the whole thing—if I am correct in my impression, when I first came to Congress. That is quite a development. Now, while the war was on we spent money recklessly. We had to; we were not prepared for it, and no one else was. The war is now over, and we have got to get back to a state of sanity. You can not keep on making appropriations with the idea of borrowing money from the people and never paying it back. Some day before long the appropriations will all have to be paid by taxes, and in addition we will have to pay interest upon the bonded indebtedness.

Twenty-five million dollars for aviation would be a very large sum for the Government to expend in all of its activities along that line. But here is a proposition to expend \$25,000,000 in one of the least important aviation activities. We have a large amount for the Army, a considerable amount for the Post Office, and then this huge sum of \$25,000,000 for the Navy. We have so gotten in the habit of talking about billions of dollars that nobody stops to think any more what a million dollars amounts to. A million dollars is a thousand thousand dollars. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA], himself an aviator, of whom we are all proud, proposes to reduce the sum to \$15,000,000. That in itself is an enormous sum of money. Let us have some sanity. Nobody will be the loser if no money is expended in the Navy for aviation except for mere maintenance. Let us get back to bedrock and know where we stand before we expend these enormous sums of money chasing phantoms. [Applause.]

I hope that we may get the amount down to \$15,000,000. I am not so sure that striking the language out of the bill on the point of order will prevent the establishment of the factory on land purchased, because the bill provides for the establishment and maintenance of aircraft stations, and they have a very elastic system of construction in some of these departments. Whether that will authorize the purchase of land for the establishment of a factory I do not know, but all of the aviation services of the Government ought in truth to be concentrated in one place, and if they can not be, then they all ought to be established upon an economic basis. [Applause.]

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANN. If I have time.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Under the act we passed a year ago, known as the Overman Act, to consolidate the activities of the various departments, could not authority be given to one bureau or department to attend to the manufacture and production of aircraft?

Mr. MANN. I do not know whether that authority is in the Overman Act or not. It is not material whether it is or not, because it is not and will not be exercised if it is in this act.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. It is material in this, that if it be in the act, it shows that Congress at least has done all that it can do.

Mr. MANN. Congress has done all that it could do about aviation, even to indulging in flights of oratory on the subject—hot air.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Yes; I think, perhaps, that has been overdone.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I think that all of the members of the committee can understand very readily that the use of the aeroplane by the Navy Department is, after all, only an adaptation for marine purposes of the aircraft that we have been developing on all lines in the United States and elsewhere. It is not a thing that pertains exclusively to the Navy. It is not a thing that pertains primarily to the Navy. It does not require for its development a large separate appropriation. We know, as everyone does, that the larger use of the aeroplane will be made by the Army. We know, as everyone does, that another department of the Government—the Post Office Department—is also developing the aeroplane. In my judgment, at this time, \$25,000,000 would be enough for all of these departments in the development of aeroplanes and in the building of them, when we take into consideration those that we already have on hand and the present state of the art, and also take into consideration the large demand that will be made for private uses and purposes of the aeroplane. It occurs to me, and I think it will to the country, that to give now this large lump-sum appropriation, amounting to \$25,000,000, to the Navy Department would be ridiculous. It would be considered a reckless expenditure of money. We have the statement by the chairman of the committee that there is no showing of necessity; that there is no itemization of amounts that will indicate where this money is to be expended. It is a temptation to needless expenditure to put this vast sum of money into the hands of the Secretary of the Navy. No man on the floor of this House could justify himself before his constituents or the country in such lavish expenditure of money.

We have always held in the House to the belief that lump-sum appropriations ought not to be made whenever they can be avoided. In this case I venture to say there is no excuse for this appropriation in a lump-sum appropriation. The Secretary of the Navy ought to have told the committee and the country how the \$25,000,000 was to be expended—how much for this, how much for that, how much for every item—so that we could determine primarily and the country ultimately whether or not it was extravagant in any particular. The time has come when Congress must revert again to that salutary rule that demands statements from these various departments with regard to the expenditures of the country. Now, when we are burdened by the greatest debt we have ever attempted to carry, and when the war is over, when we ought to get back, as has been suggested here, as rapidly as possible to bedrock, let us do it by demanding of every expenditure that is asked for by any department of the Government that they shall explain particularly item by item what they want the money for.

I shall support gladly, and I believe every member of the committee ought to support gladly, the reduction of this amount to \$15,000,000. I certainly hope the amendment will be adopted by the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question? Did the Chair understand the gentleman from Tennessee to offer a substitute?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment which I wish to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 15, insert: "And provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the construction of a factory for the manufacture of aeroplanes."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

State marine schools: To reimburse the State of New York, \$25,000, the State of Massachusetts, \$25,000, and the State of Washington, \$25,000, for expenses incurred in the maintenance and support of marine schools in those States in accordance with section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the establishment of marine schools, and for other purposes," approved March 4, 1911; in all, \$75,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to proceed to discuss the preceding paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that he may proceed to discuss the preceding paragraph. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the committee accepted, I think without a dissenting vote, the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York cutting the provision for experimental work in development of aviation for naval purposes from \$25,000,000 to \$15,000,000, a direct saving to the Government and the people of the United States, who have to pay the taxes and buy the loans, of \$10,000,000. In this connection I desire to call attention to the fact that for four or five days recently we discussed the river and harbor bill, to which great objection was made, and that bill was made up of a variety of items—400, 500, or 600, every appropriation specified. A contest on the floor over some of the appropriations involving as much as the monumental sum of \$1,000 for the improvement of a stream took up much of our valuable time. Gentlemen tore themselves into shreds opposing suggestions that we should appropriate \$5,000 for the dredging of a certain stream that might encourage the commerce of the country even in a small degree. That appropriation bill, so much opposed that the newspapers of the country actually referred to it, carried only \$26,000,000; and yet there was scarcely a State in the Union—there was certainly no coast line—that was not directly interested in that bill and the specific items which it carried. Subsequently we had before us the Agricultural appropriation bill, a bill in which every farmer of the country is interested, a bill that carried paragraphs relating to the production and distribution of our food supply, a bill that interested every producer and every consumer in the land. That bill carried, if I recollect aright, about \$31,000,000.

These two bills, I say, were contested upon this floor, in one instance the contest raging for nearly four days. The vast interests involved were pointed out in the bills. We knew where the money was going; we knew how it was to be expended; we knew it could be checked up, and it was checked up; yet here to-day, in a few minutes, without any discussion, apparently, with the newspapers taking no notice, in a paragraph of a few lines, it is proposed to sweep into the power of a single bureau the right to expend \$25,000,000, an amount equivalent to nearly all we appropriated in the river and harbor bill, almost as much as we appropriated in the Agricultural bill, in which the entire country is interested. I think it is a duty to point out the ease with which a great department of the Government, under stress of war necessity, may work into an appropriation bill and work over the Congress a tremendous appropriation to be expended at the will of a bureau when specified legitimate expenditures are so difficult to obtain.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I ask for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I think it is important to call attention to this strange condition that prevails in a legislative body in connection with aviation, not by way of reflection upon the Navy Department, which has not been criticized, so far as I have observed, for its conduct of aviation up to date, but because of the unusual proceeding in the War Department, which resulted in the exoneration of one Col. Deeds, who had been placed in charge of a part of the expenditure of \$640,000,000 for aviation for war purposes, after he had been brought to the bar by a former justice of the Supreme Court of the United States appointed by the President to investigate, and who was supported in his findings by the Attorney General. I do not hesitate to say that in the case of Col. Deeds and the expenditure of that \$640,000,000, for which, according to the Senate report, we did not secure a single combat plane in France, the results were not such as to inspire congressional confidence in lump-sum appropriations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, what I shall say is applicable to a clause of the bill which comes later; but it seems proper it should have some consideration in advance, so

that the defect in the bill which I shall point out may be remedied. I am very much dissatisfied with the fact that this bill provides no means whereby the enlisted men of the Navy can get relief—whereby men who are in the Navy and, now that the war is over, have business elsewhere can get out.

A great many of these boys volunteered and went into the Navy because they did not want to be conscripted. That was their business; they should not be discriminated against because of that fact. They see that their brothers who were conscripted into the Army are being discharged by wholesale, whereas they themselves are being retained for service. And this bill gives them no relief whatever. There is no provision in it that will hasten discharges of these enlisted men, and there is no way by which they can get out after the bill is passed any more than they can get out now.

It is true that the bill reduces the enlisted personnel for the next fiscal year to 180,000, or something about like that, but it does not provide that the boys who enlisted for the war and who expected to be discharged upon the termination of the war shall be discharged. They may be retained in service at the will of the Secretary of the Navy, and may be kept as a part of the 180,000 enlisted personnel that is to be retained.

Mr. VENABLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. For a question.

Mr. VENABLE. The bill does carry a provision that those who enlisted for four years, between certain dates, shall be discharged.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The bill carries this provision:

Any enlisted man of the Navy or Marine Corps who, since April 7, 1917, and before November 11, 1918, enlisted for the period of four years may, upon his application, made to the Secretary of the Navy on or before July 1, 1919, be held and construed to have enlisted for the duration of the war and granted an honorable discharge.

In other words, the men who enlisted after war was declared are put upon a plane of equality, if this bill is passed, with those who were permitted to enlist for the "duration of the war" only. But what I am complaining of is that all of these men, no matter of what enlistment, may be held until after peace is formally declared and the end of the war proclaimed by the President, which may be 6 or 12 months hence. All the boys who are now in the Navy, and who are marking time in an overmanned fleet, doing absolutely nothing, can be kept there until a certain period, as provided by law, after the President has proclaimed the end of the war.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman permit me for a moment?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Certainly.

Mr. PADGETT. I put in the RECORD last night, just as they were adjourning, a letter which I received yesterday from Admiral Blue, Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, setting out at length what was being done and what the directions were, and you will find it on pages 2785 and 2786 of the RECORD of Wednesday. He says:

The department has up to date directed the release of 40 per cent of the reserves, 40 per cent of the men who enlisted for the war only, and 20 per cent of the regular four-year men who enlisted since the beginning of the war.

And then he says further:

In addition to this orders have gone out during the last few days to release all the Naval Reserve men and men enlisted for the war only who are now undergoing training at the training stations and at trade schools, if they so request.

We have also ordered the release of 20,000 men of the Naval Reserve and men enlisted for the war who are performing shore duties at the various naval districts.

He goes on to say that he really does not know how he is going to maintain sufficient to operate the ships and bring the ships home. And only this morning Capt. Taussig told me that if that provision which has just been read, and which is in the bill, goes into effect, he does not know how the Navy is going to operate ships in order to bring the boys home.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for calling my attention to the letter. Of course, we have all had occasion to take this matter up with the Navy Department from day to day. I have the occasion about fifty times a day, when boys who are my constituents write to me asking me to do something for them. Of course, I do not always actually take the matter up with the department, for things are so run that a mere Member of Congress can do little except go through the motion. But the department usually gives me a polite reply, affording practically the same information the gentleman from Tennessee has given. We have ordered substantially 40 per cent out of the Navy, but what about the other 60 per cent?

Mr. PADGETT. We can not turn everybody out. And he says here:

In case of there being more applicants than can be released under the authorized percentages, those to be released will be decided by lot.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. If that is the rule, it is a very recent one. My information is—and the gentleman speaks as though there was some doubt about those who want to get out not exceeding 40 per cent—that a month ago 70 per cent of the Navy had applied for discharges. I have no doubt that 90 per cent have applied up to this time.

Mr. PADGETT. Will the gentleman permit? Do you think we ought to discharge every man that asks to be discharged from the Navy and leave the Navy impotent and wrecked? What would we do with our ships? How would we bring the boys back? We are operating troopships for the Army, and every day we see in the papers where they are bringing back thousands of men. It is going to continue for months in order to get back the 2,000,000 men over there. Shall we discharge every man in the Navy and tie the ships up, with nobody to take care of them?

Mr. HUDDLESTON. That is not the only alternative presented.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, it is. We are taking in about 1,600 a week of new recruits, but they have to be sent to naval training stations and trained three or four months before they can be put on the ships.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The gentleman leads me quite a distance from what I wanted to say, but I am going back to it just as if he had not done so.

Eighty or ninety per cent have applied for release. All of these men enlisted "for the duration of the war." The war is over. They are entitled to get home. Now, the thing to do is to go out and get some new men into the Navy if these men who are there do not want to stay in it. The gentleman assumes that they have discharged 40 per cent. I tell him that 40 per cent have not been discharged. I do not know the exact figure, but I will guarantee there have not been over 25 to 30 per cent discharged.

There will be no robbing of the Navy of such of its efficiency as is required for these times—the war is over—merely because 50 per cent of the men are discharged. We had over 500,000 men in the Navy when the armistice was signed. Fifty per cent of them would be only 250,000. The gentleman must not go astray on the thought that our Navy is charged with bringing back our soldiers from France. They have nothing to do with our transport system. That belongs to the Army.

Mr. PADGETT. I would like to say to the gentleman, on the contrary—

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Oh, I beg the gentleman not to interrupt the train of my thought. The Navy is not charged with the duty of bringing our soldiers back from France. It is true that some of our battleships are being used, as I am informed, against the advice of the higher naval officers, in bringing back some troops from France. But such troops are comparatively few in number and these ships are doing little good at that use.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. The discharge of 60 per cent of the Navy will not in any wise handicap the bringing of our soldiers back from France. The truth of the matter is that the Navy Department does not want to let these enlisted men of the Navy go. The Navy Department wants to keep them there. There are a thousand reasons why they should be let go and very few, if any, good reasons why they should be retained in the service. The best reason for the discharge of these men is that they enlisted with the understanding that they should go home about their business when the war was over. Now we are holding them on a legal technicality, on the ground that peace has not been formally proclaimed. Well, our Navy was overmanned when the war was on. It is still overmanned. There is no good reason whatever for keeping in active commission a great many of the vessels. We turned back to their private owners something like a thousand vessels when the war closed. I submit, gentlemen, that we could easily dispense with all of the enlisted men of the Navy down to the minimum that the gentleman has put in this bill—that is to say, 180,000—less than 200,000—and let these boys go home and no harm would be done to the Navy and the transporting home of our soldiers from France not be delayed to any substantial extent.

We ought to hurry up and make a more diligent effort to recruit the Navy. Millions of men are being turned out of the Army looking for jobs and there is an oversupply of labor the country over, and the duty is on the Navy Department to get

new men and put them into the Navy in place of those boys who have got something to do at home.

It is nearly impossible to get discharges, according to the reports, and the reports that come to me are unanimous. It is almost impossible to get the boys out on account of the whims of their officers. Under the rules of the department those who apply for discharges are divided into three classes: First, those who have dependents; they are given the preference. The next class is those who have urgent business reasons for desiring their discharge; they are given the second preference. The third class is those who want to finish their education; and they also are given a preference. What about the fellow who wants to be out simply because he wants to be out? Why should he not be given some consideration? He has the same right to be discharged as anybody else, and he should not be forced to depend on the arbitrary discretion of the Secretary of the Navy or the whim of some little officer somewhere who fears that he will reduce his own importance by reducing the number of men under his command.

There are men in every port, in every station, in every office, who could well be spared, men who are practically doing nothing. They are sitting there, simply warming their chairs. I do not know why they are kept there. The men themselves say they do not know. There are men in the Naval Officers' Reserve who want to get out, and they do not know why they are held. I was told by an assistant paymaster of the Navy a few days ago, who had been trying for 60 days to get out so that he might go back to his family and his business, that when his relief finally came he told him that there were 60 boys at the same station he had come from, all graduates of the paymasters' school, who had been there for a month or more and had not done a stroke of work, and most of them were pleading for discharges.

I say that the good faith of this great Nation is pledged to let every man out of the Army and the Navy as quick as it is reasonably safe to do so. I say that the man who enlisted for the duration of the war ought to be discharged. We ought not to have accepted these men for the duration of the war unless we meant to let them go when the war was over. But we accepted them. They have the moral right to be allowed to get out.

Thousands of mothers and fathers throughout the country are urging their Representatives in Congress to help them in getting their sons out of the Navy. They have to go through an intricate formula, and supplement it with technical affidavits, and then the application may be put in a pigeonhole for months, and finally some little officer says, "Your reasons are not sufficiently stated, and we can not let you go."

That is what the boys are up against in this country. Something ought to be done. We ought to have some relief from it. Something should be done by this committee. Some provision to that end should be put into this bill by amendment or otherwise. Something should be done to keep the faith of this Nation with those who enlisted to fight the battles of the country on land and sea. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I suppose I, in common with everybody else, would like to see the boys get out as soon as possible, both in the Army and in the Navy. If we should give preference to anybody, it would be the boys who are now in France.

I wanted to ask a question. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] stated that the boys who enlisted in the Navy during the war are not to a very considerable extent being used in the transport service for the purpose of bringing the soldiers back home. I wish just to preface my remarks by saying that I think the boys ought to be kept in the Navy if it is necessary, and as long as it is necessary during the duration of the war, to get the boys back from France, and I would like the gentleman from Tennessee to give me that information.

Mr. PADGETT. It is not only necessary, but the Navy is operating the troop transports of the Army, manning them by officers and enlisted men, and operating them; and only within the last few weeks they have been notified to be prepared to officer and man between 20 and 30, as I remember—more than 20—ships recently taken over under the distribution from the Germans, to be used to bring the troops back, and they are so using thousands and thousands of men.

Only this morning I was talking with Capt. Taussig, who is in charge of the enlisted personnel in the Navy, who said they were releasing them as fast as they could, but that they were confronted with the condition that if so many got out as it appeared were going to be authorized to go out by the legislation in this bill, they would be in a situation where they would not be able to operate the ships to bring the boys back from France.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Would the result then be that the soldiers who are now in France would be required to stay there longer?

Mr. PADGETT. Either to stay there longer or the Government would have to provide other ships from other countries and bring them back in ships from other countries.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Can the Government do that last thing?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know of any way to do it except to hire ships, and whether they can get them or not I do not know. I do not think it is a practical thing, I do not think it is an advisable thing, and the country ought not to be put in the condition where it would be confronted with that situation. The letter that I put in last night, of which I read a portion awhile ago, shows that the Navy is liberally discharging these men.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes out of order. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I suppose I have on an average as many applications for discharges from the Army and the Navy as any man in the House, and I suppose that I have gone to as much personal trouble in looking after those applications as possibly any other man, with few exceptions, and I have had some cases that I thought myself, looking at them solely and alone from the side of the soldier or the sailor, were deserving of prompt action on the part of the department, resulting in the discharge of the men.

But I have always tried to bear in mind the fact that it was practically a physical impossibility for the department here in Washington to adjudicate and decide each individual case as it arose, that necessarily from the very nature of the problem they had to deal with these men more or less en masse. I realize, furthermore, that the problem of demobilization in the Navy is a totally different one from that in the Army. We speak of men in the Navy as being sailors. As a matter of fact they are not sailors at all. They are skilled gunners, skilled machinists, skilled engineers, skilled mechanics of all kinds, and whenever you discharge an undue proportion of men in any of the classifications of the service, you put the battleship out of commission just as effectually as if you had discharged the whole crew. If you discharge all of your gunners aboard ship, for all practical purposes it ceases to be a battleship. If you discharge all your firemen, the ship can not sail. If you discharge all of your electricians, very soon your turrets and your gunnery machinery and your lighting plant are out of commission.

Mr. PADGETT. And if you discharge enough to make any department inefficient, the same thing is true.

Mr. VENABLE. If you discharge them to the extent where you only partially disable the ship, the ship for all practical purposes is out of commission. So when applications come in for the discharge of an undue proportion of men in any line of naval activity aboard a vessel, there is not only to be taken into consideration the merits of the individual case, but also the interest of the country generally. And surely no one would urge that we should pursue a policy which would practically dismantle your whole fleet. Until hearing from my friend from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] I would not have thought that it would be argued as earnestly and sincerely and with as much seriousness as he has doubtless argued it that because there has been an actual cessation of hostilities, for that reason there is a moral obligation upon the Government to discharge these men irrespective of whether their services are imperatively needed by the Government or not. Of course when the war ends, if it is according to the terms of their enlistment that they shall be discharged when peace is declared, the Government must discharge them, because that is its contract; but I deny that there is any moral obligation upon the Government to discharge a man when it needs him and his retention is according to the terms of his enlistment. If a moral obligation arises, it arises from the existence of an agreement or a contract.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will my friend yield?

Mr. VENABLE. With pleasure.

Mr. McKEOWN. Are there not many men in the service of the Navy who are not aboard ship, and who are not being used

to transport soldiers from abroad, who could be discharged, and ought not such men who have dependents to be discharged?

Mr. PADGETT. That has been ordered, exactly, in gross.

Mr. McKEOWN. But is it not true that the orders emanating from Washington are not having much effect with the commanding officers?

Mr. VENABLE. If my friend will allow me to reply to him, I think that there are many men in the service, possibly, who, on the merits of their individual cases, might be discharged, and I want to say that I believe as soon as the department can work out its plans for the discharge of those men and for the determination of the merits of those cases they will be discharged.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VENABLE. I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that his time be extended three minutes. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. VENABLE. Now, we go down to the departments here in Washington and we present the facts of a particular case. The department here can not, to save its life, know whether the discharge of a particular man will cripple the efficiency of a ship or not. Prompted by that reason and others of a subsidiary character, it was decided to leave the determination of these questions to the commanders of the fleet; because not only must the merits of the case be taken into consideration, but also the needs of the Government. And permit me to say right here, almost anybody can get up in the Congress and express a sense of pain. Almost anybody can get up in the Congress and criticize. Almost anybody can get up in the Congress and denounce a certain course of conduct. But, permit me to say, I do not believe that should ever be done except where the Member has the facts; and then it ought not to be done by denunciation of the entire department and system, bringing condemnation upon innocent and efficient men, but by the fixing of responsibility upon the man who is at fault; because indiscriminate criticism, the charge that certain things are being done, without proof of the facts, goes forth from this body to the country as though it was sustained, although it may not be sustained by the facts. Because a Member of Congress has said so, they therefore take it as true, and you create all over the country a wave of discontent that excites prejudice against the service. The naval service of the United States is neither Democratic nor Republican; it is American. It results in harm to the service and serious embarrassment to the chief of the departments here.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENABLE. I will.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Does the gentleman think the particular thing calculated to excite prejudice against the Navy now is holding the men who enlisted during the war to perform services which have no relation to war, but are mere matters of convenience to the Government, for the purpose of keeping ships in command, not to bring troops home from France, but simply to keep them in command?

Mr. VENABLE. I have never received any proof that officials of the Navy were arbitrarily holding anybody. There may be individual cases, which I think will be taken care of as soon as they are worked out by the department.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I want to give the House another portion of a letter. I called up Admiral Blue and asked him to give me an official statement, which he did, and I put it in the Record yesterday:

The department has up to date directed the release of 40 per cent of the reserves, 40 per cent of the men who enlisted for the war only, and 20 per cent of the regular four-year men who enlisted since the beginning of the war.

In making these releases, commanding officers of ships and stations were directed to give preference, first, to men who have families dependent upon them, and, second, to young men desiring to complete their education. In case of there being more applicants than can be released under the authorized percentages, those to be released will be decided by lot. Naturally the demobilization must be handled by the commanding officers on general orders from the bureau, as it would be impossible for the bureau to handle the individual cases.

In addition to this, orders have gone out during the last few days to release all the Naval Reserve men and men enlisted for the war only who are now undergoing training at the training stations and at trade schools, if they so request.

We have also ordered the release of 20,000 men of the Naval Reserve and men enlisted for the war who are performing shore duties at the various naval districts.

The bureau is very desirous of completing the demobilization as soon as possible, but it is confronted with the proposition of placing in commission some 38 to 40 large vessels to be used as transports in bringing home troops from France. A number of cargo ships belonging to the Shipping Board are also being manned. As you can readily understand, the present activities of the Navy, as well as those in prospect, have to be carefully provided for, otherwise they would have to cease.

It is hoped that by the 20th of February we will have demobilized at least half of the remaining personnel on shore after the releases above

described have taken place. From February 20 to March 1 we will obtain detailed statements from all stations in regard to the number of men remaining available. This we shall have to do in order to ascertain where we stand in regard to personnel.

In the meantime we are recruiting men as fast as our facilities will permit. They seem to be coming in now at the rate of about 1,600 a week. This will of course help us out in the matter of demobilization, but naturally we will not really feel the effect of this for several months, for the reason that the new men coming in are recruits and must be trained before being sent to the ships.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. All these men spoken of there, the 40 per cent, and then those in addition may obviously be discharged with entire consistency, but what I want to know is if it can be done within 30 days why should it not have been done 60 days ago? There has not been a change of a hair in the circumstances.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, yes; there has; we had something like 2,000 ships in the Navy when the armistice was signed, and many of those are being turned back and gotten rid of. It could not be done in a jiffy. To carry out the proposal of the gentleman from Alabama would wreck the Navy and bring riot in this country, because we would not have men to bring back the troops from France.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired and all time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Care of lepers, etc., island of Guam: Naval station, island of Guam: Maintenance and care of lepers, special patients, and for other purposes, including cost of transfer of lepers from Guam to the island of Cullion, in the Philippines, and their maintenance, \$20,000.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I want to say this: I do not care what the legal phase is, this war is over; the war between the United States of America and Germany has ceased. That Empire has made an unconditional surrender. It has yielded up all of the essential instruments of war, and that war is as much over as the war between the States is over. Now, that is the fact about it. Unless you are going to have compulsory military service without an act of Congress in time of peace you ought to turn these soldiers and sailors who enlisted for the period of the war loose. If you do not do it you hold them upon a bare technicality, because the war is over; the German flag has been lowered, its armies have capitulated with an unconditional surrender.

Congress ought to have the nerve and honesty, if it believes in compulsory military and naval service, to put it to a vote, but this thing of holding men in the Army and the Navy after the war is over, after the enemy's flag is hauled down, after the enemy's power has been exhausted, is a cheat upon the selective-draft act passed by this Congress.

Now, that is the fact about it. You have no more legislative right, nor moral right, to hold these fellows in the Army and the Navy, who were conscripted for the war, than you have a right to hold a man in prison after the issuance of a writ of habeas corpus. If you want them against their will to serve in a time of peace, pass a law for compulsory military and naval service, because every man, woman, and child in the world knows that the war between our country and Germany is a thing of the past, a thing that has passed into history. It does not exist to-day because of the unconditional surrender of the German forces and the taking away of every power to make war.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. The war is not entirely over so far as the soldiers who did the fighting and won the victory are concerned, and who are now at the front. It will not be over for them until they get back home. The gentleman does not believe that the men ought to be permitted to get out of the Navy if it is necessary to keep them in the Navy in order to bring these soldiers back to the United States, does he?

Mr. DIES. No; but I will tell my friend what he ought to keep in his mind, and that is the demand of every officer to have somebody to command, the demand of every man with shoulder straps and a star to have some of his boys and my boys that he may command them, and it is the gentleman's duty to see that they are demobilized and brought back to their peaceful pursuits and not kept there in order that they may maintain rank in the Army or the Navy.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Mr. Chairman, I am talking about privates, although I have no prejudice in the world against the men who held commissions. Incidentally, more commissioned men, so far as that is concerned, in proportion to their numbers were killed on the battle field than men who did not have commissions, but that is neither here nor there. Confine it to the private soldier in France to-day, who went over the top, who

made the sacrifice, who suffered much more than did the boys in the Navy, although the boys in the Navy were willing to suffer. Would it be fair, would it be proper, to demobilize the Navy to-day if that Navy is necessary to bring back from France the soldiers, the privates, and let the commissioned officers remain there?

Mr. DIES. Just what figure the Navy cuts in bringing back the privates is more than I understand.

Mr. PADGETT. I just called attention to the fact that they have to man 38 or 40 new ships coming in, and they are manning and operating to-day numbers of ships for the Army, bringing back the soldiers, and they are using battleships and cruisers to bring them back.

Mr. DIES. I do not trust the officers to turn the men loose. I trust Congress to do that, to see to it that when the war is over the gallant sons of America shall come back to their homes. The man of power wants more power; the man at the head of a committee wants more appropriations and more dignity. An officer wants more men to command, and I say that these boys who enlisted in the Army and the Navy for the duration of the war ought to be demobilized and allowed to go back home, because the war is over, and every honest man knows that the war with Germany is over.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. And I would call further attention to the fact that the excuse of keeping these boys in the service of the Navy to bring the boys back from France is a mere subterfuge. There is no reason in the world, if they need men to man the Navy, why they can not go into the labor market and hire these men after they are discharged.

Mr. PADGETT. It would take three months—

Mr. HUDDLESTON. You are forcing them to do it now. Give them a chance to act like American citizens.

Mr. DIES. I do not care what you need. In time of peace, under your present system, you are entitled to keep every volunteer enlistment in either the Army or the Navy only so long as the war exists. Every man knows that the war is over and you can not honestly keep them in against their will.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] bases his whole argument, as I understand it, on the proposition that since a large proportion of the men in the Navy enlisted for the period of the war, and since the actual fighting is over, therefore the cessation of actual fighting is tantamount to the end of the war, and hence, the war being over, these men under the terms of their contract are entitled to be released; that holding them further in the service is a violation of their contract and a violation of a moral obligation upon the part of the Government; therefore the question is, Is the cessation of fighting an end of the war? I know these young men enlisted to serve their country in their country's hour of need, and I do not believe that any of them would insist on their discharge if they believed that the country still needed them, and the reason they are asking for a discharge is because they do not believe that the need any longer exists. But the question is, Does the need exist?

The testimony before the committee was that it did. Peace terms have yet to be formulated and submitted to the German Empire. We hardly think that Germany will resist, but no man knows, and a state of war exists until all of the questions in the situation which might give rise to actual hostilities have been settled. It would be a part of folly, in my judgment, because there was actual cessation of fighting to take that as equivalent peace, and to demobilize our armed forces and thus invite a renewal of hostilities by our enemy. If that be true of the Navy it is equally true of the Army. It seems to me ridiculous that this country should at once by act of Congress demobilize every soldier in the National Army in France and Germany and discharge them from any further military discipline or obligation.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENABLE. Because if the war be over, it is as much over for the soldier as for the sailor. That is the logic of the gentleman's argument. I yield.

Mr. DIES. Does my friend from Mississippi think that the Imperial German Empire or the German Republic, or whatever government they form there, will be weaker or stronger a year or two or three or four from now than it is now?

Mr. VENABLE. I think they are weaker now.

Mr. DIES. If they are weaker now, if you keep an army there now, how much greater army will you keep there one, or two, or three, or four years in the future?

Mr. VENABLE. You will not keep any there, because you will have settled the terms of peace, and as I believe the allies will keep an army there until the terms are put into execution as far as possible.

Mr. DENISON. Suppose it should require a year before we can arrive at a settlement of this so-called league of nations, and suppose our commissioners should say that there shall be no peace until that is settled, does the gentleman think that we are in duty bound to keep these soldiers in the service until the question of the league of nations is settled?

Mr. VENABLE. We are not doing that; we are demobilizing the Army and the Navy as fast as practicable in view of the situation.

But the gentleman can not draw me away from a discussion of what I am trying to develop to a discussion of the league of nations. The argument of the gentleman from Texas was based upon the assumption that the cessation of actual hostilities was tantamount to peace; that under the terms of enlistment these men in the Navy, when peace came, were entitled to their discharge. If that is true, there would hardly be any man either in the Navy or armed force of the United States, according to the logic of his contention, who should not be demobilized at once. When you apply that conclusion to the Army in France, the unsoundness of it, in view of practical events, is immediately manifest. The same thing is true, I believe, under the facts, as regards the naval forces of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the discussion that has been going on here shows conclusively what an awful blunder the President made when he went over to France and left Congress here to flounder around in the mud.

Mr. CHANDLER of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States is now in France, and the ability of Congress to transact the business of this Government without the presidential "big stick" is now on trial. The question that confronts us now is whether Congress is able to pass legislation efficiently, effectively, and as speedily when the President is away as it does when the President is in the country and telling Congress what to do and how to do it.

That question is now squarely up to Congress.

Many Members in the past have complained that the President has dictated to Congress, has bossed Congress, and some have gone as far as to state that the President has usurped the functions of Congress.

If this was improperly done by the President in the past, now is the time to prove that it was wrongfully done, by formulating our own legislative policy.

If Congress can do business as efficiently and as effectively when the President is away as when he is here, I know of no better time to prove it than right now.

Yes; now while he is away let Congress show the country that it has policies, that it does not have to be bossed or led or driven or coerced.

If we do not pass the appropriation bills and necessary legislation before the 4th day of March, 1919, it will conclusively prove that all the criticisms that have been hurled against Congress in the past by the press of the country, by public speakers, and by the public in general is true.

It will at least show that Congress needs some leadership.

If we are to have leadership, that leadership should emanate in Congress, not outside of Congress.

If there is to be an extra session, place the responsibility for calling it upon the President.

It is our duty, our plain and imperative duty, with the constitutional notice that our lives as Members of the Sixty-fifth Congress die on March 4 at noon, to clear the legislative decks of such important matters that are expected of us by the people.

Procrastination should be sidetracked and real earnest work given to important measures that they may be disposed of before the expiration of this Congress, and the people of this country relieved of the expensive burden of an extraordinary session.

It is the duty of Congress to see to it that all legislation necessary to keep the wheels of government going is enacted by March 4, 1919.

We can not assume that the President will call an extra session.

We should not force him to call an extra session.

We should not confess our weakness by failing to enact at this session of Congress the legislation usually enacted, and legislation that necessarily must be enacted.

The people of this country will not take kindly to any conduct on the part of Congress that tends to force an extra session and keep the country in that state of unrest that usually attends a long session of Congress.

What the people of this country want is a rest from congressional activities.

It seems to me that it would be much better for the business of the country and for the labor of the country if we legislated less.

The President by virtue of his veto power is coordinate with the legislative branch, but the writers of the Constitution intended to place the responsibility of legislation upon Congress, which is the direct representative of the people.

The country wants Congress to enact necessary legislation and adjourn.

If we do not do this the people of this country will hold us responsible. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF NAVIGATION.

Transportation and recruiting: For travel allowance of enlisted men discharged on account of expiration of enlistment; transportation of enlisted men and apprentice seamen and applicants for enlistment at home and abroad, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; transportation to their homes, if residents of the United States, of enlisted men and apprentice seamen discharged on medical survey, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; transportation of sick or insane enlisted men and apprentice seamen to hospitals, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; transportation of enlisted men of the Naval Reserve Force to and from duty, with subsistence and transfers en route, or cash in lieu thereof; transportation of civilian officers and crews of naval auxiliaries; apprehension and delivery of deserters and stragglers and for railway guides and other expenses incident to transportation; expenses of recruiting for the naval service; rent of rendezvous and expenses of maintaining the same; rental, maintenance, operation, exchange, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use; advertising for and obtaining men and apprentice seamen; actual and necessary expenses in lieu of mileage to officers on duty with traveling recruiting parties, \$3,000,000.

Mr. DALLINGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been very much interested in this discussion in regard to the discharge of men from the Army and Navy. The people at home do not realize that the question of recruiting and discharging men from the Army and Navy is an executive function. As long as peace is not actually signed there is nobody except the Commander in Chief, and under him the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, who can do anything about this matter. All that we Members of Congress can do is to make suggestions and protests.

Immediately after the signing of the armistice I sent a telegram to both the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy asking if the men who had dependent families and positions waiting for them at home might not be given a preference in the granting of discharges. Other Members of this House made the same suggestion and request. As a result the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy formulated sets of rules by which men could get their discharges. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HUDDLESTON] has referred to these regulations. We were all sent copies of them and were told to tell the boys that they must file with their commanding officers applications supported by sworn affidavits, and that then these applications would be considered on their merits in accordance with the policy laid down in the regulations. The trouble has been that the subordinate officers of the Army and Navy have not in many cases obeyed the regulations that were given them.

In this connection I desire to give the House two instances which have come to my attention here in Washington within the last few days. The other morning on my way to the Capitol a nice-looking sailor boy stopped me on Pennsylvania Avenue and asked me if I could tell him how he could get in touch with his Congressman. It was a pleasure to take him with me to the House Office Building and introduce him to his Member of Congress. On the way up he told me the circumstances of his case.

His home was in one of the far Western States. He is now stationed at one of the shore naval stations—I think at Chatham, Mass. In other words, he is not one of the men engaged in bringing soldiers home from France whom some of my colleagues have been talking about. He told me that he had a wife and three little children at home whom he had not seen for more than a year, that he had a nice position waiting for him at home, and that he had filed his application with the necessary affidavits with his commanding officer right after the signing of the armistice, but could get no satisfaction at all. He also told me that at that station 82 per cent of the discharges had been discharges of unmarried men. He also stated to me that he knew of several cases where boys asked they be not discharged because they had no home to go to and no position to return to, but that they were discharged in spite of their re-

quest, and yet at the same time men who had families and positions waiting for them at home and who had made great sacrifices by giving up positions which paid them \$100 or \$150 a month for the sake of serving their country at a salary of only \$30 or \$40 a month were utterly unable to obtain their discharges.

The other instance which I have in mind is the case of two boys with whom I happened to get acquainted recently who came from the Pacific coast. They enlisted in the marines at the beginning of the war. They went over to France, where they took part in the severe fighting on the western front. They were wounded, and returned to this country. After they were discharged from the hospital they were sent down to Quantico, and have been there for months, with positions waiting for them at home, but utterly unable to get their discharges.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to utter my most emphatic protest against this outrageous treatment of our boys in defiance of the advertised policy of the War and Navy Departments. I believe—and I know that in expressing this opinion I voice the overwhelming sentiment of the people of this country—that those men who have got dependent families and who have positions waiting for them at home, and particularly those who have actually fought and been wounded in their country's service, should be discharged immediately from the military and naval service, and there is no excuse whatever for not discharging them. [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Concerning this item of \$9,000,000, Bureau of Navigation, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if he has any detailed information about how this money is to be expended?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; a great deal of it. It is not only for the purpose of getting new men in—and you see this afternoon what that means—but it is also to pay transportation of men discharged back to their homes to the place of enlistment. Capt. Lanning was before the committee, and he said that he did not think that even \$12,000,000 would be sufficient to carry on the work—

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The department asked for \$12,000,000?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. And the committee cut it to \$9,000,000?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir. The Secretary, I believe, reduced it to \$10,000,000 and the committee reduced it to \$9,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I direct the gentleman's attention to that part of the item which provides for rental, maintenance, operation, exchange, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use.

Mr. PADGETT. That is their operation, upkeep, and maintenance.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. That is the point; rental, maintenance, operation, exchange, and repair of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know or do the hearings disclose how much of this \$9,000,000 would be expended for that purpose?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir. I can not tell you. But there is a provision in the bill that prohibits the use of any part for the purchase of additional machines. And there are motor cars for official use in the different bureaus. We went into that very fully in the session last spring, and my recollection is that we had something like 450 or 475.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In the city of Washington?

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, no; in the United States.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I have no desire to criticize the Navy Department. I am very fond of it. But this item of maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles for official use has come to be the subject of criticism in regard to certain departments, though not necessarily the Navy Department.

Mr. PADGETT. I rather think not of the Navy Department, because I never heard any criticism of that kind.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I hope not. For that reason I was asking how much would be expended for this purpose by the Bureau of Navigation. I want to say to the gentleman frankly, and I think the committee is entitled to know, that Members of Congress themselves observe that many of these passenger-carrying vehicles "for official use" are not being used exclusively in office hours, and some of them are being used for what appears to be unofficial purposes. That is to say, my attention has been called to the fact that some of these machines, and they are very handsomely finished, they are high-priced machines, are being used by the wives and relatives of

the officers of the Government, not necessarily naval officers, and that they are being used for social purposes, for which, of course, this appropriation is not intended.

I have myself observed some of these official motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles—very expensive ones, limousines, with the Government coat of arms upon them and very small letters to indicate that they were for Government use—drive up to department stores and unburden themselves of some ladies who seem to be out shopping. I understand that it is possible to find machines labeled "for Government use" drawing up to some of the places of entertainment in the city of Washington, some of them to points at which dinners are given and balls are held, regardless of the fact that they are Government machines.

Mr. PADGETT. I have not heard any criticism of that kind in connection with the Navy.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I say that I have not heard it applied especially to the Navy, but there are Members of Congress who have called attention to the fact that they have seen what I myself have seen. I saw one draw up the other morning before one of the large jewelry establishments on one of the main thoroughfares leading to the Capitol, and I saw ladies leave the limousine and go into the store, and yet I noticed that the coat of arms indicated that the limousine belonged to the Government. I do not think the committee would sanction that.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think the criticism would lie against the Navy.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Nine million dollars is a large sum of money, although not all of it is to be used for maintaining motor-propelled machines; but some of it is.

Mr. PADGETT. In the last bill last spring there was a provision limiting the number of machines to be purchased for the United States for the Navy to 115, of which not exceeding 15 could exceed \$500; and were limited, I think, to \$1,800, or, maybe, \$2,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I know the gentleman from Tennessee well enough to know that he would give me a frank answer to this question if he knew any of this \$9,000,000 was being used by officers of the Government for the purpose of having the members of the family pay social calls or attend dances, or for the purposes of making purchases at department stores, and would disapprove of that practice.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, indeed; I would. I have inquired about it and am informed it has not been done in the Navy.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Not being done in the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. I understand that.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Of course it is inevitable that finally, when we enter upon this militaristic career on which we have embarked, that all these things the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] talks about will happen. Of course you can not build up a military caste in the country without having all these automobiles flying about that Members of Congress see every day. You would naturally have that. Let gentlemen console themselves. These things are crude and ordinary to start with, but finally we will polish it down to the old militaristic system that the world has become acquainted with in other days.

You take a country gentleman who has grown rich either in oil or in pork, and he moves to town; of course, he is not familiar with the customs of society, and he gets about clumsily. He gets his vestments on unhandily, and his whole movements smack of the rustican. You take a great Republic like the United States and embark it suddenly upon a militaristic career, and naturally you would expect incongruity, just as you would expect incongruity from a man who had discovered oil, you know, and had come to be a millionaire. Diamonds upon the hands of women who formerly washed clothes and automobiles for those who had formerly driven in horse carts. And, of course, you take a great Republic, like it was under Lincoln and Jackson and Cleveland, and turn it loose upon a militaristic career, and you must expect incongruous things and ridiculous things, almost. You expect men to run about in automobiles who never owned one.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman is interested in the discharge of soldiers. I forgot to say, in connection with the use of automobiles for social purposes, that I have also been informed that some of these young soldiers who are competent chauffeurs are held in the service to drive these automobiles.

Mr. DIES. Oh, to be sure. That is a part of the atmosphere of the military caste. I see them down at the humble hotel

where I stop. The boy probably, the son of a man in Illinois who defended the Union, or the son of a man in Mississippi who gave his life for the Confederacy, drives some little satrap up to the hotel, and he stands there with his hands behind him while his master pays his respects to some maiden or dances with some dilettante in the hall. We should expect that in militarism.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We might hasten the demobilization if we discharged some of the chauffeurs and let them go home.

Mr. DIES. Oh, no. The truth and fact for the American Congressman to know is that we ought to turn these boys loose, and if we want to have a different system let us write it on the statute books of America. This is a system of compulsion in war. Every man who believes in it ought to vote for military service in time of peace. Every man who believes in it ought to vote for it, or else he ought to say to these military satraps, "Turn our boys loose and let them go home." [Applause.]

You have got a right during war to requisition the services of the youth of this country. I voted for that. But when a war is over and you lay it down to the American youth, you have no right to keep them in the Army after the peril is passed. You may camouflage it, you may dodge behind a technicality, if you wish; but the fact remains that you are inaugurating a compulsory military and naval system in this country without the courage to put your vote down "aye" on the records of the Congress.

Now, if you believe that any man in this country ought to be compelled by law to serve in the Army or Navy without his consent in time of peace, vote for it. That is all right. That is the system that we are headed for. That is the system that Germany had. That is the system that France had. That is the system that Russia had, and that is the system that every Government on this earth ever had that ever raised an army in time of peace, and you have got to come to it, and you ought to come to it honestly and fairly. You ought not to hold a young fellow in here in durance vile by subterfuge. You ought not to impress a young man into the Army and Navy by saying, "You are held here against a menace," when you know there is no menace.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. Do you think we ought to put a provision in here that would prevent the Navy from bringing the boys back?

Mr. DIES. I take it that the Navy is not bringing so many of them back.

Mr. PADGETT. They are operating multitudes of ships, bringing the boys back and taking supplies over and demobilizing the Army.

Mr. DIES. In good truth, three months have passed, and less than 150,000 have been brought back from France.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, more than a million have been brought back.

Mr. DIES. Oh, no. I read the Official Bulletin, and only a week ago they said that 100,000 had been brought back from France. They demobilized a little over a million in the United States and Europe.

Mr. GARNER. To demobilize and to bring them home from France are different things.

Mr. PADGETT. I said "demobilized and brought back from France."

Mr. DIES. In fact you either need them to fight the Imperial German Empire or you should turn them loose, because you conscripted them for that purpose. What is the fact? The German Imperial Empire is weaker to-day than it will be next week or next month or next year, and if you can keep, under an international agreement, 400,000 boys against their consent on that western front now, when Germany is as weak as it is, you can keep 800,000 or a million there next year. This is a serious question, because the boys are entitled to come home. Those men are entitled to come home. Many of them are married men, and they are entitled to come back to the United States.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes.

Mr. PADGETT. I am planning for enough men to operate as many ships as possible to bring the Army back from France as soon as possible.

Mr. DIES. With all due respect for the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, my experience is that that committee, not under the influence but under the obsession of the people who wear the stars and garters and the epaulettes of military power—and my reading of history, from the dawn of civilization down, has convinced me that they want men to command

and power, and more power—and I beg leave to differ from this committee. This Congress should say to the boys who have enlisted and who have been compelled to go into the service, "Now that the war is over and Germany is quite crushed, you are entitled to come home." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. GARLAND. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIES. Yes; if my time is extended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GARLAND. The gentleman stated that a certain number had come back. Three hundred thousand per month were sent over during the war, and as much in tonnage of supplies. How many did the gentleman say came back?

Mr. DIES. About two weeks ago I read that we had brought 100,000 of them back.

Mr. GARLAND. After three months' time. Does the gentleman know whether they were from line troops, or Red Cross young men, or Young Men's Christian Association, or Knights of Columbus? All of them were figured in the number that came back. I make the assertion, knowing what I am talking about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired. All time has expired. Without objection, the pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I move to strike out the last word; and apropos of what the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] has been discussing so eloquently—he is always interesting when he takes the floor—I desire to read from a newspaper published in my city which has close foreign connections and which probably is as well posted on what is going on on the other side as any other paper in the United States—the Philadelphia Public Ledger. An editorial that appeared this morning is headed:

"Chumps" or crusaders—which will we be?—If we take a league-of-nations mandate over an unprofitable province overseas.

I want my friend to listen to this, which comes from what I regard as the official organ in the United States of things done on the other side:

Lloyd George is said to have shot into the ear of President Wilson one peaceful day as they sat peacefully together making peace in the peace conference:

"You're very generous prescribing medicine for the rest of us; take some yourself and see how you like it!"

That is the opening of this semiofficial statement that our President, sitting at the peace table over on the other side, instead of being here on this side, where we would value his services, is listening to Lloyd George, who says—

"You're very generous prescribing medicine for the rest of us; take some yourself and see how you like it."

What does it mean? What is Mr. Lloyd George telling our President over there? The article continues—

Of course, being a statesman—

This refers to Lloyd George—and a diplomat—

And this also refers very pertinently to Mr. George, for he has the reputation throughout the world of being a statesman as well as a diplomat, and a clever diplomat—

He did not put it quite that way. His exact words, according to the report, were—

This is Lloyd George to President Wilson over yonder—

"You are wanting everybody else to try this thing (the mandatory system) but you are not willing to take any responsibility yourself."

Again I ask what does it mean? Who can correctly interpret this situation?

Mr. DIES. I can think of only one worse system than that promulgated by the Democratic President, and that is the one promulgated by the Republican ex-President. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Then, the question in the gentleman's mind is that Taft may be wrong in advocating a league of nations, and that Wilson may also be wrong in demanding a league of nations before he establishes peace that will enable us to bring our soldiers home. I do not quite get the gentleman's reasoning.

I interpret this semiofficial statement of Lloyd George's attitude toward our President over there to mean that the President has advanced certain ideas with regard to entangling alliances which we did not instruct him to advance, and that Mr. Lloyd George has said, "If you want these things done that you propose shall be done over here in European affairs, where we think we have something to say, you, as the representative of the American people, will stand your share of the responsibility and the expense, and you will maintain an army in Russia, and I

you will tax your people, and you will create loans, and you will include yourself as bound to police the world." That is one reason why our soldiers now can not come back. Our President is over there, and until we get peace and he comes back, apparently we can not adjust this question. That would seem to answer the gentleman as to his demand for immediate demobilization.

Mr. DIES. I move to strike out the last word. You know, if I had to choose between our Democratic President and the last President the Republicans had in the White House, I would take Wilson, because he at least does not want the armed forces of the United States to police the world and to have us involved in a war without our consent. I hope he will not do that. My wish with regard to the President is that he was at his office, at his official place of abode, and that this great American Union could get back to the ideals of Lincoln and Cleveland and Tilden, and, going back further, could get back to Jefferson and the Constitution that seems somewhat obsolete now.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Another great American Democrat.

Mr. DIES. Precisely. I am not partisan. I wish there was a Democratic Party. I would like to belong to it. [Laughter.] I am looking forward to the time when there will be some party without a nigger in the woodpile, or Mason and Dixon's line, that an honest believer in representative and constitutional democracy could belong to. I never take any stock in these partisan byplays across the aisle. I am always wishing that some great American might arise, greater than Mason and Dixon's line, and still greater than the old hatred that is passing away of the South to the North or of the North to the South, a man who might rise to the flag of our country and the Constitution under which we live and call the people of the South and North back to the love of representative democracy. Do you know what I think of the President being over there? Well, I kind of think he ought not to be over there.

I wish he was back home, because I do not want to entangle this great, free Republic, this owner of a hemisphere, this people sufficient within themselves; I do not want to mix them up in a card game where there are more kings and queens than there are presidents. [Laughter and applause.] You know we do not stand to get anything out of these entanglements except more entanglements. England, as has been well said, gets predominancy. France gets "revanche." Italy gets back the Adriatic. But what does Uncle Sam get, except a burden and a mortgage upon the resources of this country? And I do say, Mr. Chairman, if it is the will of the Congress, now that our enemy has capitulated, laid down his arms as abjectly as Lee laid down his arms at Appomattox, we ought to be able to get our boys home. You know the War between the States did not end for several years after Appomattox, and yet the flag of the Confederacy was as much in the dust, and the Confederate arms were as much beaten after the surrender at Appomattox as Germany's flag and arms are to-day.

I do say in common honesty if you believe in compulsory military and naval service in time of peace, you ought to be made to vote for it in time of peace and not to stand on a lawyer's simple technicality. Get that into your minds, because that is the thing you are going to have to vote for. Of course it is said among the Republicans that we are keeping the boys in this sort of service because you had the vote last November, when there was a small arousing in the country. But that was only a remonstrance, when our boys were facing the German lines; and what you will get in November, 1920, in time of profound peace, if we continue the present compulsory military service in a time of peace—oh, well, I would hate to be a rooster then if this thing keeps up. [Laughter.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent: Ferriage, continuous-service certificates, discharges, good-conduct badges, and medals for men and boys, including civilian employees who render conspicuous service by putting their life in jeopardy to save life or property; purchase of gymnastic apparatus; transportation of effects of deceased officers and enlisted men of the Navy, and of officers and enlisted men of the Naval Reserve Force who die while on duty; books for training apprentice seamen and landsmen; maintenance of gunnery and other training classes; packing boxes and materials; books and models; stationery; and other contingent expenses and emergencies arising under cognizance of the Bureau of Navigation, unforeseen and impossible to classify, \$20,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am very much impressed by the attitude of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]. I think he has proved an inspiration to those of us who desire to see democracy preserved in the United States. I glory in the fact that he talks on these subjects without regard to partisan lines, and would, if he had his way, as I would, wipe out the Mason and Dixon line forever. I am glad that we have the gentleman from Texas with us, and will have him until the end of his term. He

has been a useful, earnest, eloquent Member of this House, and I shall regret to see him go. During the rest of his career here it may be that by such eloquent addresses as he has made to-day, and yesterday he may help to draw the attention of the country, as he has drawn our attention, to the dangers that confront the Nation. I will not say dangers due to mismanagement, dangers due to a particular administration, but I agree with the gentleman from Texas that vast and intricate and complex problems are confronting us which we can not too seriously consider now while he remains with us.

He has indicated that the juice of the American orange has been squeezed; that we have upon our shoulders a great burden; that men whom we have loaned to the cause of civilization and humanity are now held in leash because of a system against which he inveighs. I wish the men who are still battling in the snows of Russia were here; I wish those who are still lingering in the mud of France were back in the United States. I wish we had vessels enough to bring them, but I realize that we have not yet had issued to us by the President a proclamation of peace; and until the President does issue that proclamation, we must recognize that a state of war exists.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Does not the gentleman think that some of us here and abroad are overlooking the fact that the Senate of the United States has something to say about negotiations for peace?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes; and I hope that the gentleman's expectations may be fully verified and that the Senate of the United States will exercise the sovereign authority it possesses to pass upon the work of the President of the United States, now seemingly entangling himself in the meshes of European affairs. He promised to give us his confidence, but up to the present time he has given us no word, save that telegram to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs urging us to pass a bill for a tremendous sum to be charged against the taxpayers of the United States to prepare apparently for a future war.

Mr. GARLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. GARLAND. Does the gentleman think it entirely possible, after the settlement of peace has been entered into between the President of the United States and the leading nations, that the Senate of the United States would have the temerity to even cross a "t" or dot an "i"?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has asked a very pertinent question. My prayer is that the Senate of the United States will have the nerve to stand up against any unfair or un-American bargain made in the name of the American people without their consent. [Applause.]

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I think that the committee and the country owe a vote of thanks to the fearless utterances of our colleague from Texas. I have been convinced for weeks that there is such a reticence here among Members upon matters of such import as have been discussed by him that we are allowing ourselves to suffer a sort of decadence, which is ultimately bound to result, through the process of atrophy, in the Congress doing nothing and saying nothing. Every time anyone makes a suggestion on this side of the aisle as to what is being done that would be better not to be done, somebody announces that it is pure partisanship, and that it is not grounded on anything like sincere utterance, but simply because the administration happens to be of a different political faith. It is immediately charged by those who feel called upon to be the mentors of the House as mere partisan attack, designed to embarrass the administration. This system of espionage has been so long employed that the Members have become timid and hesitate to make any adverse comment. If I want to be called a patriot, it seems necessary for me to indorse everything that is done. Even it is demanded that we give blanket indorsement of what may be done. If I decline to indorse some of the things, even that we know ought not to be done, because of their inevitably bad results on our Government, immediately comes the charge that I am disloyal if not treasonable. We are told that we ought not to discuss in an antagonistic manner anything that is going on in France, because it indicates that we are not patriotic. These matters are of no concern to the Congress. The country must set silent and allow the President, uninstructed but self-appointed, to do our thinking. When a gentleman from the other side of the aisle will rise and in his fearlessness state what is his conviction, and dares to question the infallibility of even the head of the Nation in matters of such vital concern, the country owes him in this hour a vote of gratitude [applause], because these

things ought to be said. We have not yet reached the place where we admit "our President can do no wrong." We are entering in these days of world strife, when our President is obsessed with making world democracy universal, a stage of internationalism and entangling our feet in the meshes of European politics, by inviting our country to become the umpire of every insignificant quarrel over insignificant boundaries and other questions that are of no importance to us at all to-day.

Mr. Chairman, my office and your office become the visiting points of representatives of countries in Europe, praying to us as Members of this body to take a position in reference to some of the questions that are purely European, that have absolutely no significance in the Chamber of the American House of Representatives. I am visited, as you are, Mr. Chairman, by representatives, to be specific, of a movement in Ireland, and I am told that I shall be compelled to vote upon the question of the politics that belong to Europe and not to this country. I said courteously to the party calling upon me that I could not enter into these matters, matters purely European. I said, "You have your contests with a country that is not ours, and while I might have a sympathy for what you would want, as suggested by the policy of Gladstone back in 1884, yet it is not an American proposition; it does not belong to American legislation, and American Congressmen ought not to be asked to give interviews to representatives of European politics and European idiosyncrasies. I am not ready to turn this body into a conference for European problems. I do not think it is a proper field." And then along will come a representative from one of the mushroom republics of mid-Europe and ask that a certain pronouncement be made as a moral influence upon what they expect to win later on. While I sympathize with the ambitions and aspirations of all these new countries, we must not forget that our duty is here and not there.

Mr. Chairman, while I have been called upon to vote for the aspirations of the new republic that is growing in mid-Europe, and it is only one of probably nine, I do not think that it is the province of American Representatives to step over into the world vortex and undertake to decide what shall be the peculiar character of the government of that peculiar province, which until recently was subordinate in a sense to some other government. Those are only two instances of many that have come to every member who sits upon the floor to-day. To me it is simply an impossible situation that we should forget the nationalism that marks the American Republic, without which we are going into danger, because whenever you lose the specific morale that marks American genius and lose yourself in internationalism in Europe, the danger is not temporary; it is, I fear, perpetual. For that reason I am glad that our colleague from Texas [Mr. DIES] has had the courage to call a halt and not be afraid of being called a traitor or a disloyal man because he speaks his convictions upon the floor of the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Gunnery and engineering exercises: Prizes, trophies, and badges for excellence in gunnery, target practice, engineering exercises, and for economy in coal consumption, to be awarded under such rules as the Secretary of the Navy may formulate; for the purposes of printing, recording, classifying, compiling, and publishing the rules and results; for the establishment and maintenance of shooting galleries, target houses, targets, and ranges; for hiring established ranges, and for transporting the civilian assistants and equipment to and from ranges, \$350,000.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, I do not know when I have ever heard a discussion which interested me more than has the discussion this afternoon. Surely, in the providence of God, the day will come in this Republic when there is no South, no North, no East, no West, but when Democrats and Republicans are going to worship our great country and the Constitution under which we live. You know these discussions are fruitful. We have as the President of the United States a man who does not believe in a written constitution. We have as a President of the United States a man who does not believe in the checks and balances established and followed by Jefferson and Washington and Madison. It is particularly important to the American people for the preservation of their liberties that now that the war in Europe is over they should understand the situation in which the country finds itself. As I said, we have a man as President who does not believe in the checks and balances of the Constitution.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman give us the authority for that statement?

Mr. DIES. Precisely. I give the President's own books themselves, in which he said that Jefferson and Madison were tyros who looked through an orrery to the skies and undertook to set up a form of government responsible to Newton, who believed in mathematics, and he said that the checks and balances of the Constitution were obsolete, and that he believed

in the Darwinian theory of the growth of the Constitution, as if any sensible man ever believed that a contract could grow. [Laughter.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Does not the gentleman believe in the growth of government?

Mr. DIES. Yes; but I do not believe in the growth of a contract.

Mr. BARKLEY. The gentleman does not believe that the Constitution ought to be amended, as it has been amended several times.

Mr. DIES. Oh, yes; it can grow by amendments, and contracts and wills can grow by codicils and changes, but this man said he believed in the Darwinian theory of the growth of the Constitution of the United States. Mr. Chairman, I speak with as much responsibility upon my head as any Member of Congress representing 300,000 people of this Republic. I want neither an office, nor a star, nor a garter, nor a diadem, but I am content to believe in the Constitution of my Government, a written Constitution, with its checks and balances, to hold in check the power of despotism. And do you know I think it is the most unfortunate thing that ever happened to this Government when our President sailed away from the shores of America to entangle our destinies with the destiny and broils and quarrels of the scorbatic society of the Old World. I wish Members of Congress would get back to a sense of their own dignity and importance. There are a hundred men in this Congress who by virtue of attainment and reading and statesmanship are better qualified to fill the Presidency than the present occupant of the White House. [Laughter on the Republican side.] In the name of God, why should we turn over the practical politics of this country to an erratic statesman, to a man who never served in a legislative capacity—and I hope you Republicans will take this in good spirit.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Oh, the hilarity upon this side, I think, was due to the thought that perhaps the present occupant of the White House should be the gentleman who is acting as the Secretary to the President of the United States.

Mr. DIES. There is one thing I find about the Republicans in my 10 years' service here, and that is that they have bid louder for the radical vote than we Democrats have bid, even to the extent of their vocal powers to bid. But what we need here is a Congress under the Constitution which is one of the three coordinate branches of the Government. This Government is composed of three branches—the legislative, the judicial, and the executive—and the executive, under our present President, has usurped all the powers of government, and you and I and the balance of us sit here exercising no power. Somebody said that somebody said that somebody said that a cablegram had come from Europe that we should do thus and so with the people's money, but we sit supinely in our seats, and let it go at that. Mr. Chairman, if this Government is to be saved to the people as representative democracy, these men fresh from the people must rise in their dignity, not as Democrats and Republicans, but as American representatives of the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DIES. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DIES. I once had a joint debate with a socialist. He was the accredited organizer for the State of Texas, and I asked him a question in debate, and his answer to my question almost broke up the meeting. That question was this, "Seeing that all things are comparative by comparison, do you know of any government that ever existed in the world that gave more liberty, opportunity, hope, and freedom to the people than the Government of the United States under the Constitution?" Well, he floundered around and finally said he did not know of any such government. And I asked my friend, the Socialist Member from New York, MEYER LONDON, who, by the way, is a very intellectual socialist, the other night in a private debate if he knew of any government in the world that had ever existed in all the history of the world that by comparison was as good and afforded as much liberty, hope, and opportunity as this Government of the United States under the Constitution. He said he never heard of any. Well, is it not passing strange that upon this hemisphere our fathers have erected this great Republic of liberty, transcending all that the Greeks and Romans have done, transcending every effort of men to erect free government all over the world, and yet this President, this man, elected by the people says that the checks and balances of the Constitution render it unworkable, and that its only hope is in the Darwinian theory of evolution.

I would rather go back to my farm on Turkey Creek than sit here like you sit, having abrogated your functions as one of the three coordinate branches of the Government of the United States. It is the duty of this Congress, it is the duty of those who have sworn to support the Constitution, it is the duty of men coming fresh from the people to rise and demand that the Congress of the United States, and not any other function, should control the revenues of the Government and perform its legitimate function. [Applause.] Do you know there is a wonderful similarity between the decay of this Republic and the decay of the Roman Empire? I wish some Members of Congress would go back and read not what the good Roman Emperors said but read the history of the Caligulas, the Tiberius, those who followed the good Roman Emperors, who stifled and oppressed the rights of the people. My friends, if you want to answer the Bolsheviks, and it has a propaganda in this country; if you want to answer it, you answer it by saying, "Liberty by law, not liberty by man." I respect no man who would force power—and men love power and men abuse power—I respect liberty by law, and that in this country is the Constitution of the United States. I love it. It is the bulwark of the liberties of the people. What is Roosevelt and Wilson and Taft and Bryan and all the balance of them who come and go? It is the Constitution that divides the power between the legislative, the executive, and the judicial, and that is the written law of the land, and you ought to support it, and in supporting it you ought to do your legislative duty, which is to control the fiscal policy of the United States. And this very bill is an insult to the American Congress, because the chairman of the committee says, in effect, that the President has whispered to the Secretary of the Navy and he has whispered in an undertone to the chairman of the committee and he has passed the word along to the members of the committee and they let it percolate out by pinches, nods, and grunts to the Congress. In the name of Almighty God, it is the first branch of the Government that ought to have the respect of the people of the United States. [Applause.] You ought to know everything that is going on in Europe to-day. You should demand your rights and you should demand the rights and dignity of the people of the United States. You should legislate, you should veto some, you should assert yourself more, because if you do not do it, there are other gentlemen who will take your places who will do it.

Mr. HEFLIN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is recognized.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I always enjoy my genial friend from Texas [Mr. DIES]. He and I differ very greatly about the President of the United States, as the people of America differ with him on that great subject. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] always take delight in criticizing and nagging at the President, but prior to the recent election these gentlemen and all Republicans were loud in proclaiming that they were supporting the administration better than the Democrats were and that they would continue to support him, and it would be really better for the administration to have Republicans than Democrats. And since they have been elected they have been sitting up of nights devising ways and means to annoy and belittle the great President of the United States. The President of the United States at the close of the most colossal war in all history, when the earth was fairly drenched in human blood, and millions of human beings in God's image had been slaughtered by the machinery of war—at the end, I say, of the greatest war of all the world, when the civilized forces of mankind met in Paris to bring about conditions that would prevent war, the President went from the United States to where 2,000,000 American boys in uniform had gone, where thousands of them poured out their blood in battle, and where thousands of them sleep their last sleep in the soil of France. He went, I say, in person, representing the greatest Government on the globe, to speak for this mighty people in the interest of permanent peace. [Applause.]

He is criticized now by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES]; he is criticized now by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] for sitting at the peace table in Europe and trying to prevent war, with all its horrors.

I trust that all of our boys who died in France will be brought back by the Government, and that at home, in the quiet churchyards of the country, with that flag wrapped about their caskets, the Government will lay to rest the forms of these brave boys who died for Old Glory in France. [Applause.] I trust that the President of the United States will stay there and

urge with all the power of his brilliant intellect, with all the power that this Government can give him, and speak against war, work against the recurrence of such a war in the future.

If this Government permits this occasion to go by without going upon record as against war, and preventing war, we have been false to our generation. We have committed a crime against posterity. This Government can not afford to let that opportunity go by. I sit here in shame when I hear you on that side or this side decrying and belittling the great President of the United States. [Applause.] I have no patience with it. And I want to tell you that the American people have no patience with it.

You on that side, who promised to support the administration, what will be your answer at the judgment bar of the people two years from now, when the people ask you how you conducted yourselves during this very trying time? How will it be with gentlemen on this side, who are doing all they can to embarrass the President, when they stand at the judgment bar of the people at election time in their districts? You are going to have to face this, gentlemen. As sure as you live and I live, and God reigns, the mothers of America are against war. The fathers of America are against war, the young men and young women of America are against war, except as an absolute necessity, and if we have it in our power to prevent war and will not do it, we commit crime against human beings the world over. [Applause.]

I believe that we can form a league of nations and prevent war. But gentlemen coming from great States that manufacture the implements of death, the mighty machinery of war, decry our efforts to prevent war. I am in favor of protecting the blood and lives of the American people above the idea of putting money in the coffers of the manufacturer of implements of war.

Mr. KEARNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. KEARNS. This naval bill would put this money in the coffers of the manufacturers of implements of war, would it not?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am not talking about this bill. I am talking about the attack on the President of the United States.

Mr. KEARNS. I thought we were considering this bill.

Mr. HEFLIN. I am now considering the attack on the President of the United States.

Mr. DIES. Does the gentleman believe that a criticism of the President's books, in which he speaks of the checks and balances, is a criticism of him?

Mr. HEFLIN. The gentleman criticized the President for going away from the country. I think if the boys of my district and relations of mine can be taken by the strong arm of our Government and can go to the battle fields in France and achieve victory for our country and civilization, that the President can go there and sit at a peace table in the interest of our country and humanity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. DIES. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama this question: If the executive head of the British nation and the executive head of the French nation and the executive head of the Italian nation are willing to send delegates to the conference to act for them, and also the executive head of the Japanese nation is willing to send delegates to act for him, does not the gentleman think the President could have found, as they found, other men to sit at the table without moving the office to Paris?

Mr. HEFLIN. Not at all. We are not patterning after Great Britain or Japan or Italy or France. We are the greatest democracy in the world. [Applause.] And the great democrat of America broke all precedents and went himself to speak for the democracy of his own country. It was proper for him to go. [Applause.]

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. I will.

Mr. BARKLEY. I would like to suggest to the gentleman that the real executives of the French, of the British, and of the Italian nations are with the President at the peace table.

Mr. HEFLIN. That is true.

No, gentlemen; you had better get up something else to talk about. Let me tell you, the people who have boys in France, who have had them die on the fields of France, and who hate war, are with the President of the United States and what he is doing to prevent war. Do not doubt that. Mr. Taft is trying to keep you gentlemen from getting into a hole. Every day he is writing in favor of a league of nations, and he is the greatest Republican living—William Howard Taft. [Applause.] Not only that, but he is liable to be your nominee for the Presidency, and if we have to have a Republican as President I would rather see him elected President than any other one I know.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. No; I can not yield.

There are some pretty good Republicans, but I do not think there is any man in this House, or any 20 men in this House, who can fill the position of the Presidency as well as Woodrow Wilson can.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. DIES. If under the present administration the annual expenditures of the Navy have been increased from \$140,000,000 to \$746,000,000, the amount carried in the present bill, and the standing Army has been increased from 50,000 to the present standing Army of 500,000, how long will it be under this administration of world pacifism and benevolence until we get back to the old days?

Mr. HEFLIN. I have not seen the cablegram that the President sent. I do not know what his reasons were for making that request. But I am willing to trust him and the American people are willing to trust him in all his work at the peace table. This program can be held up by a Congress succeeding us, and instead of giving him whole-hearted support and letting the people of the world know that we are back of him, men have their butcher knives out and are trying to stab him to death, here and in another body, and playing politics at the cost of their country's welfare, when the President, the greatest man who walks this earth to-day, is laboring for the peace of the world.

The historian of the future, long after those who slander and traduce the President have passed into silence and pathetic dust, will record his greatness. Long after they have gone, this man Woodrow Wilson will live, not only in the history of America but in the history of the world; and the historian of the future will put him down as the greatest apostle of world liberty and democracy that ever appeared on the earth since Jesus Christ walked the dusty highways of Judea preaching the gospel of democracy, "Unto the least of these, my brethren." [Applause.]

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania rose.

Mr. HEFLIN. Does the gentleman desire to interrupt me?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. No; I wish to follow the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. Very well. I have been up in the gentleman's country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. DECKER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DECKER. I do not know that I want to take all that time.

Mr. Chairman, I had intended before leaving this body permanently to prepare a short speech presenting my views on some of these questions that have come up this afternoon, but I am moved to speak extemporaneously by the remarks made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], for whom I have a profound respect. And more especially am I moved to speak by the universal applause that I heard on the Republican side following his remarks.

The gentleman from Texas appeals for the exercise of independence by the legislative branch of this Government. I have a right to speak for that doctrine, for I have not only preached that doctrine but I have practiced it from the beginning of my congressional career. You may say that I have been wrong in my judgment, but you can not say that I have truckled to Executive authority.

Let us review a little history now. Back in the days of the McLemore resolution, around the cloakrooms and in the lobbies of the hotels two-thirds of the Representatives of this House on both sides, Republicans and Democrats, talked in favor of warning Americans against riding on the armed ships of

belligerent nations. You Republicans who applaud the gentleman's appeal for congressional independence now when the danger is over and 50,000 American graves are marked in Europe, how did you answer the roll call on that fatal day? [Applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DECKER. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman knows how I voted.

Mr. DECKER. You voted as I did.

I am not saying I was right. Oh, no. I am saying that the majority of the men on both sides of this aisle thought that I was right then, but when the roll was called many of them yielded their judgment to the judgment of the Executive.

And then talk to me about your independence! Why, you Republicans solicited votes last November on the ground that you had followed Woodrow Wilson more loyally than Democrats had followed him, and now you ridicule and criticize the President and boast of your independence.

Oh, how some men rant and rave, and how they sneer, and how they pour forth their villification and abuse against our great President to-day. And there are some Democrats who do it as well as Republicans. I am not speaking as a partisan now. They do this because of his 14 points. Oh, how they sneer about that league of nations. Oh, how they sneer about "open covenants openly arrived at." Oh, how they sneer about self-determination and the rights of little peoples to have a say in what shall be their future destiny. If you were so independent, if you had so much courage, gentlemen on that side and on this side, if you thought so much of the Constitution, if you understood so well what were the duties of the Representatives of the American people, why did you not sneer and why did you not stand up and voice your opposition when Woodrow Wilson, the spokesman for America, enunciated his "14 points"? [Applause.] Why did you not speak then? Oh, you may smile. There was one Republican that had the courage to speak out at that time. I heard him. I listened to him; and I want to say to you, call him traitor as you may, denounce him as pro-German as you may, I have more respect for him than I have for Democrats and Republicans who now sneer at Woodrow Wilson's 14 points, including the league of nations.

I refer to Senator LA FOLLETTE, who stood in the Senate of the United States like a lion. Not now, when there is no danger politically, oh, no, I will say to the chairman of the Republican congressional committee; not now when the election is over, not now when the war is won and when the dead are counted by the thousands, and the crippled and the maimed are coming back home; no, no, LA FOLLETTE did not wait until the war was over to sneer and demean and abuse and vilify Woodrow Wilson; but in the hour of danger he stood like a man before the world and said it was the duty of Congress to say by solemn enactment what was the purpose of this war. If you did not believe in Woodrow Wilson's "14 points," why did you not stand up then and say what the points should be? Why did not the Republican chairman of the congressional committee who has just spoken stand with Mr. LA FOLLETTE then? If he did not have the courage to stand with LA FOLLETTE then and have Congress state its "points," it strikes me it is a little late now, when the war is over, to sneer at the President's points and to talk about the independence of the legislative body. [Applause.]

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DECKER. Yes; I will always yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DENISON. I was going to ask my friend from Missouri if he does not recognize a difference in the right of criticism when our country is at war and when we are at peace?

Mr. DECKER. No. It is the difference between courage and cowardice. That is the only difference. If you believed your country was being guided onto the shoals of destruction, if you believed that danger lay ahead, was it then your duty to be silent when Woodrow Wilson, as leader of America, proposed to adopt a certain policy? I have differed from him. I have differed from him openly and earnestly. I indorsed his 14 points then. I indorse them now. If you thought your country was endangered by his policies, then was the time to speak. Why not?

Oh, I know it was dangerous. You might lose your office, indeed. There are boys from my district who will never hold an office. They sleep under the lilies of France. They sleep amid the poppy fields of Flanders. They died for our country. Could not you and I afford to speak and vote for our country?

Now, do not misunderstand me. Let me recount my record. I did everything in my power to keep my country out of war. I knew war meant entangling alliances when my country went

to war. I did everything I could to uphold the hands of Woodrow Wilson as the constitutional leader of our Army and Navy in time of war.

I did this because I thought it was the surest way to win the war. The war has been won, but our responsibility has not ended. At the cost of blood and treasure we helped to destroy the German Government and its power for evil. We have helped to shake the foundations of autocracy in Europe. Have we no right, have we no duty, to help to build something better in its place? We can no longer say we have no interest in European affairs. We are to-day bound to European nations by bonds of interest and sentiment. These bonds were welded in the white heat of war. It is idle to talk longer of our grand isolation.

This is a strange doctrine to come from the source it does—to come from men who voted to send our boys to Europe, who voted to tax the children yet unborn in order to participate in the European struggle—and I am going to grant for the sake of the argument that you were right and I was wrong—it is a strange doctrine to come from you, now that this great country, after it has done all this, should have no participation in the affairs and destinies of European nations. Is there a man here who believes that when another war comes, another great war, that it will be possible for us to refrain from entering that war? Is there one? Ah, we boasted of our isolation, we were proud of our freedom from European entanglements.

But what will happen when the next war comes? Will we enter it? Of course we will enter; we will enter it quicker than we went into this war. Then I stand as one to declare the doctrine that if the boys of our country must die in the next great war that starts across the seas, if our children's children yet unborn must pay the bonds and share the burdens of the next world war, then I want my country to have something to say about the starting of that war. I want my country to be in a position at least to try to prevent that war. [Applause.]

League of nations? Yes; I am for it. League of nations? Yes; I believe it will be the greatest step that was ever taken in all the history of mankind. You sneer at mandates. I do not know exactly what they mean, but I will tell you what I believe: I believe in a league of nations that has got a "bite in it," a league of nations that will have the power to enforce its decrees, a league of nations that will have the power to say to a Government like the rotten, corrupt, despotic, and inefficient Czarism Russia, and to a despotic, brutal, and powerful Government like Germany, if such a Government shall ever rise again, "Thus far shalt thou go and no further." [Applause.]

Mr. DIES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DECKER. I yield.

Mr. DIES. Is the gentleman in favor of compulsory military service to enforce the decrees of a league of nations?

Mr. DECKER. I believe in compulsory military service in time of war. I said that the night that we declared war against Germany, and I say it now.

Mr. DIES. Does the gentleman think we should have compulsory military service to settle the war between France and Italy?

Mr. DECKER. That is the same as what we have had, and I voted for it, and so did the gentleman from Texas. He voted for conscription to settle this war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DECKER. I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks that his time be extended five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'SHAUNESSY. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion? I want to suggest that the independent legislators who were against conscription, in the Military Affairs Committee, voted against it and spoke against it in the committee, but came out and voted for it and spoke for it on the floor of the House.

Mr. DECKER. Does not the gentleman think it would be better to have spoken then than now—I do not mean safer? [Laughter.] I am for legislative independence in this body. I think this House affords opportunity for as great service as any place on earth. I do not think that the man ever lived that was big enough to completely fill his seat in this House. I do not care how great a man he may be; I do not care how much his learning, how much his courage, how much his foresight, he will never get too big to hold a position in this legislative body, and he will have more than he can do when he gets here if he does the work. I am for the independence of this body. I was for it before the war. I am for it now.

Mr. DIES. I did not quite get the response of the gentleman to my question.

Mr. DECKER. They interrupted me.

Mr. DIES. In the event of the league of nations and in case of a quarrel between, say, Italy and France, would the gentleman from Missouri be in favor of compulsory military service in the United States to make our boys go over there and settle that dispute?

Mr. DECKER. That is a fair question.

Mr. DIES. I think so.

Mr. DECKER. I thank the gentleman for suggesting it.

We ought to meet those things; we ought to meet them as legislators. We ought not to be talking so much about standing by the President. He needs no defense from me. He will be remembered long after you and I have been forgotten. His place in history is already made. The kinds of things that we should consider here are questions like the gentleman from Texas has asked me, and if you will give me time, I will tell you what I think about it.

Mr. DIES. It ought not to take long to answer that.

Mr. DECKER. Longer, my friend, than you dream of. [Laughter.] Let us go back to fundamentals. Who has the right to declare war? Our Constitution says that Congress has the right to declare war. If every Congressman would stand in his place and vote on that question of peace or war as he thought the people of his district wanted him to, you would get a pretty good reflex of the sentiment of the country at the time war was declared.

Then if a majority of the people wanted war, then I am for compulsory military service. To be frank with you, the man who is against compulsory military service in time of war, and who says that it is not democratic, confuses this proposition. It is not democratic to conscript people to go to war when the majority of the people of a country do not want the war. I admit that. But if a majority of a people of a country want war, then there is no way so democratic as compulsory military service.

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. DECKER. Oh, wait just a minute. Three of us are in a boat. We are out on a stormy river. Two think we ought to go across. Two vote to cross the river, and I vote not to go. The majority rules, and we start across. Do you not think that they have a right to make me pull my oar?

That is what compulsory military service in time of war means. It is the right of the majority to make the minority pull its oar when the boat is in danger.

If the people of this country, through honest representatives or through a referendum by the people, declare in favor of a league of nations of the world, then there can be no war between Italy and France. That war must necessarily be between Italy or France and the rest of the world.

If my country, by the will of a majority honestly registered, should enter a league of nations in order to prevent war and maintain international order, then in order to carry out the decree of that league of nations I would vote to conscript the last man and the last dollar. We do the same thing in a county when we empower a sheriff to summon any and every citizen to assist in the capture of a murderer.

Mr. DECKER. Then I would vote to conscript the last man and the last dollar to carry on the war to prevent a war. Gentlemen, you can sneer at Woodrow Wilson all you please; you can talk about his 14 points, and you can sneer about the affairs of Lithuania and Esthonia and Jugo-Slavia and the rest of those words we never heard of before the war. The only little country I knew about over there before the war was Ireland. [Laughter.]

Mr. DIES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DECKER. When I am through with this idea I will answer the gentleman. Oh, be ye not deceived! You gentlemen on both sides of the aisle can get up here every day and read letters full of complaints about the conduct of the war. Yes; most of them are just.

When you Republicans get full control of the House you can start your investigating committees to grinding, and you will find some corruption, just like there was when you ran the Government in 1898, just like there always will be when a country goes to war, a democratic country. That is one reason I am in favor of a league of nations to stop wars. That is one reason I would be willing to vote for a league of nations to prevent war, for the reason that I do not believe that democracies can endure and have a war like the present war once every 50 years. It is a human impossibility, and you know it. War means militarism, militarism means despotism. It means corruption, yes. It means inefficiency, yes; and you knew it all the time; you knew there would be when you voted war—every one of you.

You knew it always had been—

Mr. DENISON. No—

Mr. DECKER. Well, then, you have not read the history of this country and the history of other countries. Let me tell you Republicans something: After you have picked around over the many mistakes of the War Risk Insurance Bureau and talked about Mr. Hoover and the price of wheat and the price of other things that the people are not satisfied with, do not forget this, that the people of this country know these things themselves, and still they are backing up the Government and the flag. [Applause.] You can pick many flaws, but the people of this country have not forgotten what the war was about. Some of you would rather sneer at world democracy and put the war solely on the ground of national rights.

That may be ground enough; but the mothers whose boys sleep on the other side, the boys who stagger home maimed and blind—they are not caring so much about the questions of international law, whether a merchant ship has a right to be armed fore and aft for defensive purposes; but I will tell you what the boys are thinking about. I will tell you what their mothers are thinking about. They are thinking about the glorious fight for humanity and for the emancipation of the world. [Applause.] I will tell you what they are thinking about. They are thinking about the war to end all wars. They are not thinking about whether Mr. Lansing was right when he said that the right to arm merchant ships under certain circumstances was "a doubtful legal right." Men hesitate to go to war. I mean go themselves and fight for legal technicalities. Courts might change the law before they get back home.

But on the question of human liberty, on the question of the freedom of the world, on the question of making the world safe for democracy, on the question of ending wars, mothers may well be proud to give their sons and men may well be proud to die. Sneer and scoff as you may about the idealism and theories of Woodrow Wilson, but I believe that the thing that will most console the mothers, whose boys will not come back, the thing that most will ease the pain of those who limp from wounds or grope in blindness, the thing that will be the greatest pay and bring the greatest pride to the heroes of this war, is a league of nations to enforce peace, the highest effort at least to end all wars.

The Clerk read as follows:

Outfits on first enlistment: Outfits for all enlisted men and apprentice seamen of the Navy on first enlistment at not to exceed \$100 each; for civilian clothing not to exceed \$15 per man to men given discharges for bad conduct, undependability, or inaptitude; in all, \$10,000,000.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, we have had a helpful discussion this afternoon, innocently started by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], carried on by the gentleman from Ohio, and delightfully wound up by the gentleman from Missouri. I do not believe, however, that this discussion should continue to a point where we should lose our tempers or immediately determine the affairs of the Nation, at home and abroad. My distinguished friend from Alabama, however, has helped to lift the gloom that has settled over the House, and his speech has cheered. He has given us one of those exhibitions of his fire and eloquence which gentlemen are permitted to enjoy only when he is thoroughly aroused in defense of the President of the United States. I am relieved now that he has spoken, as I was troubled before he spoke. I was in great concern when the eloquent gentleman from Texas, vying in his attractiveness, if not in vehemence, with the gentleman from Alabama, ventured upon the new, bold, and almost untried field of democracy with the thought that we should get back to normal. I admire the gentleman from Texas, who made a frank statement that if a few more brave and courageous Democrats should take the stand that he did it might help to draw the attention of the country to the fact that many things are done in this House in the name of patriotism, and sometimes at the instance of the President, that ought to be brought to their attention. I was troubled as the gentleman from Texas was troubled and as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] was troubled with regard to entangling alliances into which we seemed to have entered without the consent of the people of the United States. I was troubled lest the clever diplomacy of the experienced diplomats of Europe might outwit even the wit of the President of the United States, who undertook in his own person to transact abroad the business of this country in the name of the Congress and of the people.

But, oh, I was gratified when my good and handsome friend from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] again entered the lists and came to the rescue. When the gentleman from Alabama was speaking, when he drew attention to the steel interests of Pennsylvania, when he endeavored to draw in the chairman of the Republican congressional committee and besmirch this splendid

discussion with a political stigma, I could not help but think that if his demand was for peace he should not be sustaining this presidential bill, which proposes to tax the people more than \$700,000,000 to increase the implements of war and to perpetuate in the world the spirit of hostility which he decries.

I sent to my office while the gentleman from Alabama was speaking—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. FOSTER. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs if he proposes to proceed with this bill to-night?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir. I think it will be necessary to proceed until about 10 o'clock. I was hoping that at the conclusion of this the House would be satisfied with this discussion.

Mr. FOSTER. I think, after the gentleman has his five minutes, I shall object to anything further.

Mr. PADGETT. We shall proceed to the consideration of the bill and limit debate. We have been very liberal to both sides in allowing this discussion.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The gentleman has been very liberal. I thank the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank also the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER], although his interruption came at that particular part of my address which was most inopportune. But I expect he will let me get to it in due course. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] is my "mutton." I ask the attention of that gentleman, because I have been wondering, lo these many weeks, if his eloquent voice was to be stilled; if it had finally come to pass that the President had no defender upon this floor. But he has spoken. We are reassured. The messenger to my office has brought me the tribute a constituent, who is very close to me, has desired I should pay to the President's gallant defender.

Listen, my colleagues:

TOM AND TUM.

When the President is tourin'
And the country's feelin' blue
And the boys are kind a-worryin'
Not knowin' what to do,
It's just a bit refreshin'
And it thrills you thro' and thro'
To know that Tom is on the job
And Tumulty is, too.

[Laughter.]

The fellers out there on the farm
Who heard their daddies tell
About the great George Washington
And Liberty's old bell
Have done a sight a' kickin'
'Cause the President has slid,
But they didn't know that Tom and Tum
Was sittin' on the lid.

[Laughter.]

It don't make any difference
What the Constitution says,
So long as we don't get mixed up
With all them foreign jays;
But even if our President
Should slip a cog or two,
We've got our Tom and Tumulty
To fall right back onto.

[Laughter.]

There may be cause for grievin'
When the boss is "over there,"
His taking House and Hurley
Kind'a left us in the air;
But no matter if the eggs
Is in one basket, like, you see,
We've got a couple good ones
Left in Tom and Tumulty.

[Laughter.]

And while we had a better sight
Kept Creel upon this side
To keep the truth a-goin'
And to stem t' insurgent tide,
The cables is a-workin'
And the mails is in the bag,
And with Tom and Tum a-watchin'
There ain't nothin' going to lag.

[Laughter.]

'Nother thing: It 'taint in order
Much for us to criticize,
When without exactly knowin'
We should be infernal wise;
What the President is doin'
He is doin' as he said,
And it's up to Tom and Tumulty
To keep it in their head.

So, if anyone's been thinkin'
'Bout alliances and flukes,
And tanglin' Independence up
With Princes and with Dukes,
Remember, while the boss is
Speakin' langwidge to them kings,
That Tom will run the Ship of State
And Joe will pull the strings.

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I probably would not have attempted to say anything here this afternoon had it not been for the speech of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DECKER]. It seemed to me that he tried to leave the impression that every Member of this House who voted to lay the McLemore resolution upon the table did not vote his convictions and that all such were cowards when they cast their vote that way. I want to say that I was one of those who voted to lay the McLemore resolution on the table. The reason that I cast my vote that way was because I believed that American citizens had the right to travel on the high seas. [Applause.]

He said the reason we went to war was to save the world for democracy. Have the Members of this House forgotten the sinking of that great steamship, the *Lusitania*, when it was torpedoed in the dead hours of the night, when without any warning 1,200 innocent souls went down into a watery grave in the Atlantic Ocean—men, women, and defenseless children—a great many of them American citizens? We can still hear the cry of the little babe clutched to the breast of its mother when it came up through the icy waters of the Atlantic in the dead hours of the night when the *Lusitania* went down. Do the Members of this House forget how Kaiser William called the captain of that submarine boat to his side and pinned on his breast the iron cross and commended him for that dastardly deed that he had committed? Oh, we can still hear the so-called ministers of the gospel in their pulpits in Germany justifying the sinking of the *Lusitania* and glorying in it.

Why did this country go to war? On January 31, 1917, the Imperial Government of Germany informed President Wilson that on the very next day—oh, they were very liberal; they gave us 24 hours' notice to take our boats off the high seas—on the very next day, the 1st day of February, they would sink every American boat flying the American flag in certain waters of the Atlantic Ocean, where we had a perfect right to go. To have accepted that proposition would have meant the surrender of American sovereignty upon the high seas.

That is why this country went to war. We did not go to war to save the world for democracy. Our armies went to France to lick Germany, and we did our part in helping to lick Germany. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] says the fathers and mothers of this great land of ours to-day are praying for a league of nations. The fathers and mothers are not concerned about a league of nations. Their boys have done their part; they have licked Germany. What the fathers and mothers want now are their sons returned to their homes in this land. Yet the President of the United States would have us, a great Republic, entangled with all those fighting, snarling, snapping little nations of Europe, and keep the boys over there to police those countries during all their troubles.

I for one do not subscribe to that sentiment. We have done our part. Let us bring our boys home, where they belong. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MANN. This item carries an appropriation of \$10,000,000 for outfits on first enlistments. What was the amount available for the current fiscal year?

Mr. PADGETT. Nearly \$25,000,000.

Mr. MANN. How was that carried? On a deficiency bill?

Mr. PADGETT. In the original bill there was \$9,975,000 and in the deficiency bill there was \$15,000,000, and they said they would be able to turn back into the Treasury about \$5,000,000 on account of the cessation of hostilities.

Mr. MANN. Well, this sum is used practically, I take it, for paying the cost of the outfits of enlisted men?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. It is estimated that \$50,000 will be needed for civilian clothing and discharged men—\$15 a suit. You will notice there is an item there for that.

Mr. MANN. That provision is for civilian clothing, not to exceed \$15 per man, to men given discharges for bad conduct, undesirability, and inaptitude?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MANN. Certainly the Navy does not discharge 50,000 men?

Mr. PADGETT. I said \$50,000.

Mr. MANN. The \$10,000,000 is practically paid for the first outfits?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. That contemplates \$100,000, first outfits in the next fiscal year?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; on account of the large number of men going out and the new recruits that have to come in.

Mr. MANN. What is the Navy going to do? Is it going to let the men out of the service who went in supposedly for the period of the war, but who were in fact induced to sign a 4-year enlistment?

Mr. PADGETT. The Secretary of the Navy stated and the others stated that they thought these men ought to be treated alike, and that they did not want to keep in the service a dissatisfied personnel; and the disposition is that wherever a man makes an application that is founded upon a good ground, to discharge him.

Mr. MANN. Now, this is the fact: The naval recruiting stations throughout the country, when the war commenced, solicited men to enlist in the Navy, stating to them that it was an enlistment for the period of the war.

Mr. PADGETT. A great many say that they so understood it.

Mr. MANN. I am not talking about how they understood it. I am talking about what the naval recruiting officers told the men. It is not a question of understanding. Do not let us mix it up. They told the men it was for the period of the war. Then when the men were transferred to the point where they signed their enlistment papers, they were handed papers to sign, enlisting for four years, and they signed them. What else could they do? Now, the question is whether the Government is going to keep good faith with them, or hold them to the technical enlistment?

Mr. PADGETT. I stated that the Secretary, as well as the others—

Mr. MANN. I know the gentleman said the Secretary stated it, but that does not answer the question.

Mr. PADGETT. And then we have a provision in the bill here providing that those who enlisted after the declaration of war, for a period of four years—

Mr. MANN. You have a provision that the Secretary of the Navy may discharge them. He can do that now. The provision in the bill does not amount to I O U. There is nothing to it. He can discharge them now, and there is nothing to it except this one thing, possibly: He said for a long time that he could not give them an honorable discharge. All you provide is that he may give them an honorable discharge, but that does not require him to discharge them. Now, if the good faith of the Government requires it to settle contracts which are not legal in form, or requires it to pay money to men solicitous to invest in mining operations, if the good faith of the Government requires it to do these things for men who gave materials to the Government, I should like to know whether the good faith of the Government does not equally require it to keep true the statements made by the recruiting officers who induced the men to enlist.

Mr. PADGETT. I have stated that that was the purpose and the policy of the Secretary and of the Bureau of Navigation.

Mr. MANN. That is what they say, but they do not do it. What is the use?

Mr. PADGETT. They say they are doing it very rapidly.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows they are not discharging these men rapidly. They say they need the men in the service. The gentleman said this afternoon that they needed the men in the service.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Very well. That is not the question. The question is not whether they need men in the service but whether they will keep faith with the men who went into the service.

Mr. PADGETT. The men who went into the service during the war are still in the service under their contract. The war is not yet ended; but the department, as rapidly as it can do so consistently with the safety of the Navy, is discharging them. The gentleman would not have these men discharged in a body and leave the ships so that they would be unmanned and could not be operated.

Mr. MANN. If I had made an agreement with a young man enlisting in the Navy, and had asked him to enlist for the

period of the war, I would let him out at the end of the war if the heavens fell.

Mr. PADGETT. But the war is not yet at an end.

Mr. MANN. Oh, I know; but I am trying to find out what the Navy is going to do. Technically the war may not be over, but it is really over, and the Navy Department have not announced any such policy. On the contrary, they have said they propose to hold the men to this four-year enlistment contract.

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir; because the Secretary of the Navy has already directed 20 per cent of them to be discharged.

Mr. MANN. Then the other 80 per cent are to be held contrary to good faith?

Mr. PADGETT. No; because numbers of them enlisted for four years, intending to remain four years.

Mr. MANN. Of course that is the paper they were required to sign.

Mr. PADGETT. No; others went in there to stay four years.

Mr. MANN. If they are willing to stay, let them stay; but if they want to get out the good faith of the Government ought to let them out.

Mr. PADGETT. Where they entered that way the department is dealing with them that way.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Illinois will give me his attention, on page 18 of the bill is a paragraph intended to cover the situation the gentleman complained of, and which I think he correctly complained of. That provision provides that a man enlisted for four years shall be held to be construed to have enlisted only for the duration of the war, so that it is not optional on the Secretary of the Navy to keep them in for four years after the bill becomes a law.

Mr. MANN. Well, let us speak. I will read the paragraph; it is on page 18; and then I will ask the gentleman's construction of it.

Now, if the gentleman is willing to change the word "may" to "shall," it will accomplish the purpose; but it means nothing as it stands.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It should be changed to "shall."

Mr. IGOE. Does the gentleman mean that the men shall get a chance to do this. Our experience has been that when orders are given of this kind men never get at it. Why not say that those who want to stay may apply?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. After the war is over and peace officially declared this language will accomplish what the gentleman from Missouri desires. The word "may" should be changed to "shall."

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval Home, Philadelphia, Pa., pay of employees: One secretary, \$2,200; 1 foreman mechanic, \$2,200; 1 superintendent of grounds, at \$1,080; 1 steward, at \$1,200; 1 store laborer, at \$660; 1 matron and office assistant, at \$720; 1 beneficiaries' attendant, at \$480; 1 chief cook, at \$660; 1 assistant cook, at \$540; 1 assistant cook, at \$480; 1 chief laundress, at \$420; 2 laundresses, at \$360 each; 3 laundresses, at \$300 each; 1 chief scrubber, at \$420; 3 scrubbers, at \$360 each; 1 head waitress, at \$480; 4 waitresses, at \$360 each; 4 waitresses, at \$300 each; 1 kitchen attendant, at \$540; 7 laborers, at \$600 each; 5 laborers, at \$540 each; 1 stable keeper and driver, at \$660; 1 master at arms, at \$900; 2 house corporals, at \$600 each; 1 barber, at \$600; 1 carpenter, at \$1,200; 1 painter, at \$1,200; 1 painter, at \$1,020; 1 engineer, \$1,080; 4 laborers, at \$720 each; 3 laborers, at \$840 each; 1 laborer, at \$600; 1 chauffeur, coal truck, at \$960; 1 chauffeur, small truck, at \$840; 1 chauffeur, governor's car, \$840; total for employees, \$40,820.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph just read. I wish to inquire what the policy of the committee was as to the increase of salary providing for the various officials and employees enumerated in the paragraph just read.

Mr. PADGETT. There was an increase for each one of them. These salaries are very low and they are paid out of the interest on the Navy pension fund. The Navy pension fund was established many years ago by the sale of naval prizes, and this constitutes a trust fund, and this institution is supported out of the interest on that fund.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume that each one of the various officials and employees will receive \$240 flat allowances that Congress is disposed to vote to all employees of the Government?

Mr. PADGETT. I suppose they will.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have no objection to the increase of the lower salaries of employees. I wish to ask whether, in the increase of salaries, the committee took into consideration that they would receive the additional allowance that is going to be paid to the employees of the Government generally?

Mr. PADGETT. We thought that they would get the same bonus that the others get. All of these salaries are very low.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am asking whether the committee, in arranging the increases, took into consideration the fact that they would also receive the additional allowance?

Mr. PADGETT. I stated I so understood—that they would get the same benefit that others get under the general law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Here we have—and I am more concerned about the two higher officials—a secretary who is raised from \$1,800 to \$2,200 and a foreman of mechanics from \$1,800 to \$2,200. Each one would receive, in addition to the \$400 increase, \$240, which would make \$640. Does not the gentleman think that that is a large increase in one year?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; but these salaries have been distressingly low heretofore.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does not the gentleman think that in view of the allowance of \$240 the salaries carried in the bill for the secretary and foreman of mechanics should be fixed at \$2,000?

Mr. PADGETT. These were recommended by the governor of the home, who is very familiar with the institution.

Mr. STAFFORD. If reduced to \$2,000 then they would be \$40 more than the governor of the home recommended.

Mr. PADGETT. He did not include the bonus which would be \$240. The committee thought that that was reasonable and as they are paid out of the interest on the trust fund which is a pension fund we thought it a reasonable allowance.

Mr. STAFFORD. Owing to the fact that the Congress has taken the position in favor of giving \$240 net increase to all, and the fact that the governor of the home recommended a maximum salary of \$2,200 to these employees, would not the gentleman agree to have the salary of these two employees fixed at \$2,000 which would make \$2,240 salary?

Mr. PADGETT. If the House did that upon a motion, well and good. The committee thought this was a reasonable salary as a basic salary.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course if the gentleman is not willing to give to these employees \$40 more than the governor contemplated in his recommendations, I shall feel constrained to make the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. I suggest to the gentleman that he withdraw the point of order and make a motion to reduce the amount.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will that be supported by the gentleman?

Mr. PADGETT. I shall not oppose it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order and offer the following amendment, to strike out in line 21 the figures "\$2,200" and insert "\$2,000" and in line 22, strike out the figures "\$2,200" and insert "\$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STAFFORD: Page 12, line 21, strike out "\$2,200" and insert "\$2,000"; page 12, line 22, strike out "\$2,200" and insert "\$2,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Navy is hereby temporarily increased until June 30, 1920, from 131,485 to 225,000 enlisted men, so that the total number of enlisted men of the Navy, regular and temporary, shall not exceed a total of 225,000 men: *Provided*, That the phrase "authorized enlisted strength" as applied to the temporary enlisted personnel for purposes of computations based thereon for temporary officers shall be 131,485 men: *Provided further*, That of the total authorized temporary enlisted strength of 225,000 men there is estimated and included 82,000 men for the operation of the ships of the Army transport service and for the operation of the ships from the Shipping Board, and in the event the operations of such ships do not require the full number of 82,000 enlisted men, the number of men less than 82,000 not so required shall be discharged from the service out of the temporary increase herein authorized.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph just read. I remember in the general debate and in the discussion under the five-minute rule that the question of the permanent enlisted ranks of the Navy was adverted to. I remember the gentleman's explanation as to the policy to authorize only this maximum strength of 225,000 men upon the contingency that a certain number, 82,000, I believe, would be used by the Shipping Board in the transport service.

Mr. PADGETT. Will be used by the Navy in the operation of the ships for the Shipping Board and the Army transports.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire whether this would not recognize for all time the permanent enlisted strength of the Navy at 225,000 men.

Mr. PADGETT. Not at all, because it says that the authorized strength is increased from 131,000 temporarily to June 30, 1920, and it is limited to that time by express words. It would have to be increased after July, 1920, by act of Congress. Otherwise, it would go back to the permanent authorized strength, 131,485, plus the 6,000 enlisted apprentice sea-

men and the Hospital Corps of about 5,700. That is all that is provided by permanent law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has any testimony been furnished to the committee as to the number of men that will be needed when the present Navy program is completed and put in commission?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. Capt. Lanning insisted, and the Bureau of Navigation sent in a report for 217,000 and odd, but the committee did not think it would require that many for the reason that they were putting it on a basis of a larger complement of ships.

Mr. STAFFORD. Was that basis on a full complement or the active warfare basis?

Mr. PADGETT. They were estimating that the complement of the ships should be the full complements on all of the ships.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I think he misapprehended the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin. As I understood the gentleman from Wisconsin, he inquired whether any estimate has been made of the number of men who would be required when all of the ships heretofore authorized were finished. Personally I do not know of any such estimate.

Mr. STAFFORD. That was my question, as to the number of men that would be required to man our ships when the present authorized program is completed.

Mr. PADGETT. No; for the simple reason that we only went to the ships that would be in commission up to the 30th of June, 1920, the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. STAFFORD. And it was estimated that 207,000 would be required for a full complement of those ships?

Mr. PADGETT. Two hundred and seventeen thousand.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That included 20,000 men to man the transports?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Of course, the men required to man the transports are expected to be withdrawn after the end of the next fiscal year, and that would mean 197,000 men. Is that on a basis of a full complement for the fighting ships on a war basis?

Mr. PADGETT. Not on what you would call a war basis, because on a war basis they have an extra allotment for casualties and for training. It would be on the full complement, but not as heretofore called the peace complement.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, I remember in the discussion before we entered the war that there was complaint made by the Navy officials that the various naval ships were only equipped with some 60 to 75 per cent of the necessary men required.

Mr. PADGETT. This is known as the reserve complement. In the peace complement, for instance, take a battleship and it can be operated, say, with 1,050 men. In war times that ship would have perhaps 1,550 men upon it. They estimate that for the full complement in keeping it in activity there would be, say, 1,400 men. Now, in making our estimates and putting it at 225,000 we have gone on the supposition that in the distribution in peace times 1,050 men would be sufficient on a ship instead of 1,400, and on what is known as the war complement or in actual warfare there would be, say, 1,550.

Mr. STAFFORD. With 197,000 required to man ships that will be in commission at the end of the coming fiscal year would it be a rash estimate to say 300,000 men would be required when all the vessels that are now under contract are put in commission?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I think that would be excessive. I do not think it will require that many.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that the recommendation of the Bureau of Navigation of 197,000 men for the regular ships of the Navy was thought excessive by the committee and that is why we did not increase the authorized strength of the Navy above 143,000 as provided by existing law.

Mr. PADGETT. We wanted to leave that so as to make it permanent if it is to be increased, so that when it is gone into it can be done under more quiet times than now, on a more natural, normal peace basis.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say further to the gentleman from Wisconsin that is what the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation provided for keeping the destroyers in commission and all of the Ford boats—Eagles—and a lot of the other craft that could reasonably be put out of commission or in reserve in time of peace.

Mr. STAFFORD. And it is the policy of the bureau, as recommended by the committee, that a large number of destroyers will be placed in reserve? How many have we in all?

Mr. PADGETT. Three hundred and forty-two.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It would seem that would be an economical and proper course.

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman will understand the department has put no promise on that. It is only talk among ourselves.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

The authorized enlisted strength of the Marine Corps is hereby increased to 26,297 men, distribution in the various grades to be in the same proportion as is now authorized by law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph just read. I would like to have some expression on the part of the chairman of the committee or some other member as to what the policy of the committee is as to the temporary force and the permanent force of the Marine Corps.

Mr. PADGETT. Under existing law the permanent authorized strength of the Marine Corps is 17,400. Under the temporary strength the Marine Corps is 75,500. This legislation proposes to increase the permanent strength from 17,400 to 26,294 and to increase until June 30, 1920, the temporary strength to 50,000 instead of 75,000, as it now is. That is the next paragraph.

Mr. BUTLER. Does the gentleman insist on his point of order? If not, I will make it. I do not think it is subject to the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not think it is, either.

Mr. STAFFORD. I would like to know the reason for this policy to increase the permanent force of 17,000 to 26,200.

Mr. PADGETT. In the naval bill last year, which was approved July 1, by a Senate amendment the permanent strength of the Navy was increased to 131,485.

They did not put anything in the provision for the increase of the Marine Corps. That was left unprovided for and, not being in the amendment, was not in conference, so that the conferees could not deal with the question of the increase of the Marine Corps. The increase of the Navy was agreed to. There has been a sort of general understanding that up to a certain point the Marine Corps would be one-fifth of the Navy, and this puts it at one-fifth of the 131,485. The commandant of the Marine Corps submitted a detailed statement, which appears in the hearings, recommending a permanent increase to 33,000. The Secretary of the Navy did not approve of that, but very earnestly recommended and approved an increase to 26,297.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman withdraw the point of order?

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. BUTLER. I suppose a point of order will not lie against this paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. I think not.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdrew the point of order.

Mr. BUTLER. I know. I will renew it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania renews the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. He agreed with me that he does not think it will lie.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not think it would lie, because of the provisions of the act of 1908. Therefore, I am not going to impose—

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the provision of the act of 1908?

Mr. PADGETT. The increase of the Navy and the increase of the Marine Corps are in order on the appropriation bill.

Mr. BUTLER. The act of 1908 reads:

Provided, That hereafter the number of enlisted men in the United States Marine Corps shall be such as the Congress may from time to time authorize.

Mr. PADGETT. The point of order is not made. Let us read ahead.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, no. We are not going ahead with this. This means \$78,000,000, and you gentlemen who are sitting here should know it. I want you, when you vote for this, to understand what you are doing.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania make the point of order?

Mr. BUTLER. I will make it for the purpose of having the Chair rule on it.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman send the provision to the Chair?

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman who is now occupying the chair understands the rules of the House as well as any Member, and consequently I hand to him this in order that he may rule upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The language which the gentleman sends to the Chair is:

Provided, That hereafter the number of enlisted men in the United States Marine Corps shall be such as the Congress may from time to time authorize.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, Congress has to appropriate for the number, and it has always been treated and dealt with in the appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Has this question been passed upon before?

Mr. BUTLER. It has not. There has always been a dispute in the committee about it.

The CHAIRMAN. Legislation is not in order on an appropriation bill. Merely the expression "shall be such as the Congress may from time to time authorize" does not necessarily mean that it can be authorized upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. BUTLER. The Congress could, if they saw fit, I think. There is another provision following it, passed eight years later, which provides that the officers of the Marine Corps shall be based upon the enlisted force of the Marine Corps, as provided by Congress, anticipating quite clearly that the object of the language and purpose of the language is to divert the question of the size of the Marine Corps to Congress. It is not provided there that they shall be the number of men that Congress shall appropriate for. This is not a legislative bill, but an appropriation bill. I have always had my doubts about the authority.

The CHAIRMAN. This seems to be a somewhat important proposition and, to the Chair, an entirely new proposition. The Chair is very anxious not to make an incorrect ruling upon this.

Mr. STAFFORD. May I suggest to the chairman of the committee that he pass by the paragraphs relating to the Marine Corps and give an opportunity to the Chairman to look up the law?

Mr. BUTLER. Let me have a little—

The CHAIRMAN. The law is here and the rules are here.

Mr. PADGETT. What was it the gentleman from Pennsylvania wanted to do?

Mr. BUTLER. I wanted to have a little talk with the gentleman from Tennessee. Now, I would ask the gentleman from Tennessee, in view of the enormous increase of the appropriation that will be required if we pass that, if it should not be deferred to a later date and reorganize permanently this Marine Corps? Now, I would have no objection to the chairman of the committee making a temporary increase in the Marine Corps to about 50,000 men. In the next paragraph he has authority to do it. If the Chair should hold that this paragraph is in order upon this bill and it should be passed, it means an increase of an enormous number of officers for the Marine Corps, which I do not believe we will need in time of peace.

I do not want to argue that. I have no stroke at the Marine Corps. I care for it as I do for my own child. At the same time, I want the gentleman to understand that this is an increase from \$13,000,000 to \$78,000,000 for the Marine Corps, as much money, almost, as we appropriated for the Navy in past times.

Mr. PADGETT. This does not increase to that extent.

Mr. BUTLER. I am willing to go in for a temporary increase. This will increase it from \$10,000,000 to \$12,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Not that much.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, yes. It is eight or nine thousand.

Mr. PADGETT. Let the Chair rule on it.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes; let the Chair rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule.

Mr. SLOAN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Nebraska desire to be heard?

Mr. SLOAN. It was a question with me whether the authority lies in that statute. If it does not, it does not authorize them to be increased in this bill. It authorizes them to be increased by Congress, and it is assumed that will be done in an orderly way and not in a way that is not orderly.

The CHAIRMAN. Yet it seems to be a very strange thing that that provision should have been put in the law—

Mr. BUTLER. It is surplusage—

The CHAIRMAN. Unless it was intended to apply to an appropriation bill. It says:

Provided, That hereafter the number of enlisted men in the United States Marine Corps shall be such as the Congress may from time to time determine.

Of course it may be—

Mr. BUTLER. It seems like a repetition or an addition, Mr. Chairman, if you will permit me, of language that need not be there. As the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN] has just said, it does not authorize Congress to do what it does not have the right to do. It does not authorize Congress to do something in violation of the rules.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that that language has no meaning whatever unless it was the intent of the Congress at the time it was passed that the number of men in the Marine Corps should be limited by the appropriations made by Congress from time to time. We can limit the number now and the amount of money we appropriate for the Marine Corps. If you do not give it that construction it has no meaning at all, because the Congress that enacted that provision of law certainly knew that future Congresses might change the substantive law affecting the Marine Corps.

Mr. SLOAN. I will ask the gentleman from Missouri if he does not think that if Congress intended that the number of men should depend upon the size of the appropriation Congress would have put it in those words instead of this language?

Mr. ALEXANDER. If I had framed the language I would have done that.

Mr. BUTLER. If it had said, "The number of marines that Congress shall hereafter appropriate for," there would be no doubt about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is going to sustain the point of order.

The Chair will state that probably on an important matter like this some reason ought to be given. The general rules of the House prevent legislation upon an appropriation bill or anything that changes existing law. Here is a proviso in this act of 1908 which would appear upon the surface to undertake to make law, and it does make some sort of law, but it does not seem to be intelligent law. The Chair thinks the safest course is that we rely upon the general rules of the House, in view of the uncertainty of the meaning of the language that is involved in the act of 1908, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The authorized enlisted strength of the active list of the Marine Corps is hereby temporarily increased until June 30, 1920, from 26,297 to 50,000, distribution in the various grades to be in the same proportion as is now authorized by law: *Provided*, That as and when the number of the enlisted personnel of the Marine Corps serving with the American Expeditionary Forces is reduced below the number of 23,703 the temporary enlisted personnel shall be reduced by the difference between 23,703 and the number still serving with the American Expeditionary Forces.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. PADGETT. I wanted to offer an amendment to this paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is why I reserved the point of order. I presume the gentleman wishes to change some of these numbers.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. On line 7, page 16, strike out "26,297" and insert "17,400."

Mr. BUTLER. That will give us the whole temporary force?

Mr. PADGETT. That will give us the whole temporary force. Then below—

Mr. STAFFORD. In line 12—

Mr. PADGETT. I suppose we had better leave that other just as it is, because that is the estimated number that might be in France.

Mr. STAFFORD. How did you arrive at that?

Mr. PADGETT. They have 25,000 in France.

Mr. STAFFORD. I suppose the number "23,703," which I find in lines 12 and 13, is obtained by deducting 26,297 from 50,000?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. If you are going to amend the "26,297" to "17,400," why should not that number be increased by inserting the number "32,600"? In the logic of mathematics that would follow.

Mr. PADGETT. That will be all right.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 7, strike out "26,297" and insert "17,400" in lieu thereof.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, may I now ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. If this amendment should be adopted and the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin is adopted, changing those figures, the result will be by the passage of this paragraph that we temporarily increase the Marine Corps to 50,000 men, with temporary officers only?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; and the temporary officers are limited to the grade of major.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee has the floor.

Mr. PADGETT. In line 12, page 16, strike out "23,703" and insert "32,600."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers a further amendment. There are two amendments pending. The Clerk will report the second.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PADGETT:

On page 16, line 12, strike out "23,703" and insert in lieu thereof "32,600."

The CHAIRMAN. Is it desired by the gentleman from Tennessee that they be put together?

Mr. PADGETT. The other one has been agreed to. I want to come to line 14. In lines 14 and 15 I want to strike out 23,700 and insert 32,700.

Mr. STAFFORD. Thirty-two thousand six hundred.

Mr. PADGETT. On second thought that will not do, for the reason that we are providing that the temporary force shall be 50,000. There are only 25,000 in France now, and that would simply mean that we were increasing it to 42,000 men, because the difference between 25,000 and 32,600 is 7,600, and instead of 50,000 you would only have 42,400. It would be better just to put the first one 17,400, and the other one is based on the number in France.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PADGETT. I will withdraw the other amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 7, strike out "26,297" and insert "17,400" in lieu thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Now I withdraw the other amendment.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I was going to suggest to the chairman of the committee that if he would offer an amendment changing "23,700" to "25,000," the exact number we have in France, and then put 25,000 in line 15, the language would be absolutely correct.

Mr. PADGETT. There are a few in excess over 25,000 in France.

Mr. BUTLER. Make it 26,000.

Mr. PADGETT. We had better make it 25,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Has the gentleman a further amendment to propose?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; in lines 12 and 13 strike out "23,703" and insert "25,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, lines 12 and 13, strike out "23,703" and insert in lieu thereof "25,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Does the gentleman purpose to change the number in lines 14 and 15?

Mr. PADGETT. I do. I propose to make it 25,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Now, Mr. Chairman, in lines 14 and 15 I move to strike out "23,703" and insert in lieu thereof "25,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, lines 14 and 15, strike out "23,703" and insert in lieu thereof "25,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the first word. It is a peculiar pleasure to do anything we can for the marines. The gracious courtesy that has governed their conduct toward American citizens and the gallant chivalry they have exhibited on the battle field are worthy of the best eras and the best efforts of the soldiers and sailors of the Republic in this and all wars. They have treated the question of sending their men home with so much consideration for the wishes, the interests, and the needs of the taxpayers that if there is anything this Congress can do for the marines, within its powers and limitations, I think it ought to do it. I am very glad to have the opportunity to say that.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

All officers comprising the probationary or temporary officers of the Marine Corps and officers of the Marine Corps Reserve on active duty, and permanent second lieutenants holding temporary appointments in higher grades, shall be eligible to fill vacancies hereby created by transfer to the permanent Marine Corps in the grades held by them on the date of transfer in the proportion not to exceed 42 in the grade of captain, 42 in the grade of first lieutenant, and 56 in the grade of second lieutenant. Transfers so made shall be made without regard to age in grade, and if not found qualified in said grades to lower grades after qualification: *Provided*, That no transfers so made shall be to a higher grade than captain, and all officers so transferred shall establish to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Navy, under such rules as he may prescribe, the mental, moral, professional, and physical qualifications to perform all the duties of the grades to which transferred: *Provided further*, That 25 additional marine gunners and 25 quarter-master clerks are hereby authorized.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. My purpose is to inquire whether it is not necessary to reduce the number of officers authorized in this paragraph by reason of our failing to increase the permanent enlisted strength of the Marine Corps?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir. I think not. They wanted 200, and the committee reduced the number to 140.

Mr. STAFFORD. They desire 200 officers on the permanent enlisted force for 22,600 men. The House has adhered to the present enlisted strength of 17,400.

Mr. PADGETT. This is not an increase of the authorized number. The law of August 29, 1916, fixes the number they are entitled to in different grades. This is only to allow them to take into the service men from the temporary service who can qualify under the authorizations already allowed. Instead of giving authority to fill it all up, this is to allow a limited number to come in from the temporary force who can qualify. It does not add to the number of officers that are authorized if they had the men to fill them.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the purpose in the last proviso?

Mr. PADGETT. The last proviso does add some clerks, but that is because they are short of the number required for the efficient operation of their guns.

Mr. STAFFORD. It does not relate to the enlisted force of the Marine Corps?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendments which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 17, page 16, strike out the words "probationary or." In lines 19 and 20, page 16, strike out the words "and permanent second lieutenants holding temporary appointments in higher grades." And in line 6, page 17, change the word "the" to "their." In line 10, page 17, insert after the word "twenty-five" the word "additional."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments proposed by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The 200 officers, as I understood, were for 33,000 marines instead of 26,000; therefore ought this not to be reduced?

Mr. PADGETT. No; they are short of officers under the organization. The number they have in each grade is fixed by law. There is a certain percentage—4 per cent—of enlisted personnel, and this is simply to allow this many temporary officers to come in and qualify. It does not add to the total number of authorized officers. It gives an opportunity for 140 officers that are in the temporary service to qualify and come into the permanent service to fill up the gap that exists there. It does not add to the number in the permanent service.

Mr. McKEOWN. I had an impression that the 200 officers requested were on the theory that the Marine Corps would be 33,000, and your committee has reduced it to 26,000.

Mr. PADGETT. No; it was a question of how much we would take in of the temporary force.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enrolled members of the Naval Reserve Force and of the Marine Corps Reserve, other than commissioned and warrant officers, who have performed active duty during the war, may, upon their own application, be transferred to the regular Navy and Marine Corps, respectively, to serve the unexpired term of their enrollment in such rating or rank as they may be found qualified under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe: *Provided*, That such transfers may be made not in excess of the authorized enlisted strength of the Navy or Marine

Corps: *Provided further*, That members so transferred shall be entitled to and receive at the time of transfer the same pay, rights, privileges, and allowances in all respects as though regularly discharged and re-enlisted immediately upon expiration of their full four-year enlistment in the regular Navy or Marine Corps.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. Let me state to the gentleman what the purpose of this is. We have enrolled men in the Naval Reserve Force in the Navy and in the Marine Corps who have been serving during the war. When the war ends they go back to inactive duty, but they are in the Naval Reserves. In order to encourage enlistment in the Navy and in the Marine Corps this simply allows a man to count as a part of his four years' enlistment, when he comes in to enlist regularly, the time he has actually served in the war. He counts it as service in the Navy and the Marine Corps instead of in the Reserve Corps. He has been serving in the Navy and the Marine Corps under the designation of reserve. This simply allows him to get the benefit of that as a part of his four years' enlistment.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, before the Clerk begins to read, may I ask the chairman of the committee how late he proposes to stay, so that we may answer gentlemen who come here with a similar inquiry?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I have stated to a number of people that if it became necessary I would ask the House to stay as late as 10 o'clock, but we are running along nicely now, and I think that we can get to a point in the bill much earlier than that where we can quit, and be able to finish the bill by to-morrow night.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not think the gentleman will be able to finish it to-morrow night.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, I think we can.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman indicate the place in the bill where we might read to and then rise?

Mr. PADGETT. I think if we read along through these items that are not disputed we might go down to the Marine Corps, which is on page 43.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then the gentleman does not expect to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow morning?

Mr. PADGETT. I wanted to.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is asking a very unreasonable thing if he expects us to go to-night to page 43 and then meet to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

Mr. GARNER. There is no contest about any of these items.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the gentleman from Texas will examine the bill he will see that we are now considering everything that is new legislation, which demands explanation, and which has not been made in general debate by the chairman or anyone else.

Mr. GARNER. We will be through with the new legislation in two or three pages.

Mr. BUTLER. I want very much to accommodate the gentleman from Tennessee for two reasons: First, he ought to be accommodated, and, second, he is always trying to accommodate somebody else; but I have been sitting here continuously since 11 o'clock this morning, and I am 63 years old.

Mr. PADGETT. So am I.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, no.

Mr. STAFFORD. I think the gentleman ought to indicate some page before that.

Mr. GARNER. We want to get through to-morrow.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is impossible, with the fight there is on the naval program.

Mr. PADGETT. I think we can.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is indulging in idle dreams.

Mr. GARNER. There is no dispute about a lot of this along here.

Mr. STAFFORD. The amounts carried are thirty and forty million dollars, increased threefold over what it was two years ago.

Mr. BAER. Have we covered the appropriations for submarines yet?

Mr. PADGETT. Submarines are all mixed up with everything else. I suggest that page 39 will be a good place to stop. The Clerk read as follows:

All enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps having war service and who may hereafter be discharged or who have been discharged from the service since November 11, 1918 (other than a dishonorable discharge), and before the expiration of their full enlistment shall receive, under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, an honorable discharge, and shall be furnished with transportation to their homes, with subsistence and transfers en route.

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, so as to ask about the words "war service."

Mr. PADGETT. They mean those who have been serving in the Navy during the period of this war.

Mr. McKEOWN. That will cover all persons?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. DUPRÉ. In connection with the inquiry of the gentleman from Oklahoma, does the gentleman from Tennessee think that what he has said will be in anyway controlling in the application of this bill when it comes to some body who interprets it?

Mr. PADGETT. I think so. It is carrying out the recommendations of the department. They want to have this that way.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I am very glad to have the assurance of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Is not this existing practice and the law?

Mr. PADGETT. No; under existing law a man gets an honorable discharge only if he serves out the full four years; in other words, completes his contract.

If he gets short of the four years he gets an ordinary discharge. There is nothing dishonorable about an ordinary discharge, but the ordinary discharge does not carry with it transportation and it is not an honorable discharge. Now, these boys who entered, many of them, for four years, intending for the war, if they get a discharge they do not get an honorable discharge, but an ordinary discharge. This is to give them an honorable discharge and their transportation.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Any enlisted man of the Navy or Marine Corps who since April 7, 1917, and before November 11, 1918, enlisted for the period of four years may, upon his application made to the Secretary of the Navy on or before July 1, 1919, be held and construed to have enlisted for the duration of the war and granted an honorable discharge: *Provided*, That said enlisted man is otherwise entitled to an honorable discharge.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. BROWNING. I was going to make a motion to amend.

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve the point of order to see whether we can secure an agreement on the suggestion to be made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING] to insert the word "shall" instead of "may."

Mr. PADGETT. There is no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, on line 11, page 18, by striking out the word "may" and inserting the word "shall."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, line 11, strike out the word "may" and insert the word "shall."

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was proposed some time ago. I do not think it is worth while to say very much about it. It was the intention of the committee when that passed that this should not give the Secretary of the Navy the privilege of "may," but that they "shall" be discharged.

Mr. PADGETT. The only thing I want to call attention to is that when you put the word "shall" it makes it exceedingly drastic, and by operation of law all four-year men who come in from that time go out with the men who enlisted for the period of the war and you leave the Navy bankrupt of men.

Mr. BROWNING. I want to make it drastic; it is my purpose to make it drastic. If these men want to come back, they can reenlist.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Just a moment, will the gentleman from New Jersey yield?

Mr. BROWNING. I yield.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I want to ascertain why this difference between the Navy and the Marine Corps. Releases from the Marine Corps are comparatively simple. I understand every application of men in that corps must be presented to the Marine Corps headquarters here, but when it comes to some one in the Navy, why, then under a comparatively recent ruling that matter must be handled by the superior officer of the man who asked to be released from the Navy; but in the Marine Corps the only man who can discharge another, unless I have failed to follow these varying changes of orders, is that in the Marine Corps the last appeal is to the headquarters here. I am very glad that is the case. Will the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING] give me some information as to how the difference exists between the Navy and the Marine Corps?

Mr. BROWNING. I do not know, in answering the gentleman's question, just what particular difference he has reference to. I only want to say in this instance there seems to have

been a misunderstanding with a great many young men who enlisted in the Navy. It was stated on the floor sometime ago that a great many of these young men had enlisted for the period of the war, but when they came to sign their papers it read they should enlist for four years. Now, the object of this amendment is to allow these men who enlisted for the four years to get out of the Navy.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman from Tennessee permit me to pursue this inquiry?

Mr. PADGETT. We would like to make progress.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I am inclined to make progress, but I would like to know something about this particular proposition.

Mr. PADGETT. The difference between the Marine Corps and the Navy is that—

Mr. DUPRÉ. With regard to releases?

Mr. PADGETT. The Marine Corps is like the Army. It is on an Army organization. There they do not have charge of ships and vessels, and a man could be discharged from the Marine Corps without reference to the ship. When a man is on a ship you have to consider what condition it is going to leave the ship in when he is discharged. For instance, if you reduce the number of gunners, the number of machinists, the electricians, or any others of those on a ship, below a certain point, you destroy the efficiency of the ship.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman may have his time extended five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING] has the floor. The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DUPRÉ] asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New Jersey be extended for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The situation, as I understand, is this: With regard to releases from the War Department, it has been made quite clear—and even the Chief of Staff has finally made it clear—that requests in that regard must be made through the military channels and transmitted to the superior officer of the man who is in the military service. Very good. I have no complaint to make in that regard. With regard to the men who are in the Navy, I understood that previous to the order that issued from the War Department a similar announcement was given from the Navy Department. Is that true? I ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT].

Mr. PADGETT. I thought the gentleman was addressing the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING].

Mr. DUPRÉ. I was trying to get information. I do not care from whom I obtain it.

Mr. PADGETT. What was your question? I was reading here and not listening.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I was asking if it had not been true until very recently, and is it not true now, that the only way for one who is in the naval service—I am not talking of the marines, because I have that in reservation—is it not true that the only way one in the naval service can secure release is to make application through his immediate commanding officer?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir; he has to make it there.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Very good. And there is nothing to be done through the Bureau of Navigation or by appeal to the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I understand if it is refused by the commanding officer he can have it renewed by the Bureau of Navigation.

Mr. DUPRÉ. That is very good so far. Now, we are coming to the Marine Corps, which was the matter we were discussing. I understand now that if one is in the Marine Corps and seeks to get relief that, not as was the case in the Army, not as was the case in the Navy proper, it is still vested in the major general commandant of the Marine Corps?

Mr. PADGETT. I think it is both ways.

Mr. BROWNING. It is both ways, but the gentleman forgets that there is no such situation in the Marine Corps in their enlistment as to time. They are either enlisted for the war or four years. In this case it seems to be the case of young men who have enlisted in the Navy being fooled.

Mr. PADGETT. A man can apply direct to the commandant of the Marine Corps, I understand.

Mr. DUPRÉ. That is what I wanted to bring out. I understand the condition is this: Whenever he is in the Marine Corps it is permissible for him, or somebody else having an interest in him, to present his claim to the Marine Corps for release?

Mr. PADGETT. I so stated. He could present it directly to the commandant.

Mr. DUPRÉ. So, if that is the case, why may it not be done to the honorable Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know why the difference was made. You would have to get that from the Secretary of the Navy. I do not know why he made the difference.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BROWNING] has expired.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I ask time in my own right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Louisiana is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. DUPRÉ. The gentleman from Tennessee should find out from the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Daniels, why this distinction is being made between the men of the Marine Corps and men enlisted in the Navy.

I would like to know why this differentiation exists between the Navy and the Marine Corps in that regard?

Mr. PADGETT. I stated to the gentleman that I did not know why it was; that the Secretary made the difference, but I could not tell the gentleman why he made it.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I repeat my inquiry in that regard, and it seems to me that the chairman of the committee, who comes here and asks us to swallow a lot of things that gag a great many of us, should be able to answer a simple question like that. Will the gentleman seek to ascertain the reason?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I will try to find out.

Mr. DUPRÉ. And will the gentleman put it in the RECORD when he finds out?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I will try to put it in the RECORD if I find out.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Well, that does not quite satisfy me. [Laughter.] The gentleman said he would seek to ascertain, and then seek to put it in the RECORD.

Mr. PADGETT. I said I would seek the information and put it in the RECORD if I ascertained it.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman put it in the RECORD in that event?

Mr. PADGETT. I will.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, what was the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey?

Mr. GARNER. To strike out "may" and insert "shall."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GARNER. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 15, noes 0.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PADGETT: Page 18, line 14, after the word "discharged," insert the words "on his arrival at a home port."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee just what that means?

Mr. PADGETT. It means this: Under the language it says he shall be granted an honorable discharge. Suppose a fellow is on a ship in China or somewhere else. He ought not to be discharged over there. He ought to be discharged when he arrives at a home port.

Mr. BROWNING. But suppose, Mr. Chairman, he is down at Guantanamo Bay or in San Domingo. Has he got to wait until he comes home?

Mr. PADGETT. I think so.

Mr. BROWNING. I am opposed to that.

Mr. PADGETT. I will withdraw it, Mr. Chairman, rather than have any controversy over it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee withdraws the amendment. The Clerk will read.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I do that in order to find out about the application for a discharge. I would like to inquire of the

chairman whether or not under this language the application must be made directly to the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. It should be addressed to him, but it would come through military channels. It would be forwarded.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It does not say anything about that. But if you go to the Secretary of the Navy and ask to have a man discharged he will tell you that his application must be made to his commanding officer.

Mr. BROWNING. The gentleman will understand that there are a whole lot of rules that we do not put into the law. The Secretary of the Navy can make his own rules. There is no trouble about that.

Mr. DUPRÉ. He will make his rules to suit himself.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. You say the application will be made to the commanding officer, but it will be forwarded to the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. He will make his rules and regulations for carrying it out.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Under this clause that we are now on, a man who is not entitled to honorable discharge would not get any kind of a discharge until the four years are up, would he?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. Where is the language authorizing that?

Mr. PADGETT. This simply provides that he shall be held and construed to have enlisted for the duration of the war, and will be granted an honorable discharge, provided he is entitled to an honorable discharge.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. The way the bill is drawn, though, does not the question go not only to his honorable discharge, but to the question that he is held to have enlisted only for the duration of the war?

Mr. PADGETT. No. He is held to have enlisted for the war, and he would be given an honorable discharge, or an ordinary discharge, or a dishonorable discharge; but this gives him an honorable discharge if he would be entitled to it otherwise.

Mr. CONNALLY of Texas. So it is the intention of the committee to draw this bill so that, irrespective of whether he is entitled to an honorable discharge, he is held to have enlisted only for the duration of the war?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Suppose the term of enlistment of a man in the Navy expires when he is out at sea. Just what happens?

Mr. PADGETT. He is always brought home and discharged here.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. So there will be no trouble about this then?

Mr. PADGETT. None at all. The only reason I offered it was because they said they thought it would clear up the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps who enlisted for the period of the war may, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe, extend such enlistment for a period of one, two, three, or four full years and shall be entitled to and receive the same rights, privileges, pay, and allowances in all respects as though regularly discharged and reenlisted immediately upon expiration of a full four-year enlistment.

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve a point of order on this important paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. The purpose of it is this: Here is a man in the Navy or Marine Corps who enlisted for the period of the war. He served, say, a year and six months, and he wants to get into the Navy or the Marine Corps permanently. This is to allow him to extend his enlistment so as to make it the full term of four years, counting the time that he served under this temporary enlistment as a part of his full enlistment. It is along the same lines as the preceding paragraph.

Mr. STAFFORD. As I read it—though I do not read it with the full knowledge that the chairman of the committee has—I should think this really provides for the extension of enlistments for one year, two years, three years, or four years, as the enlisted seamen may elect.

Mr. PADGETT. Certainly; but it says that he shall have the same benefits as if he had reenlisted upon the expiration of a full four-year term. Now he has to serve a four-year term in order to get the benefit of a four-year term; but during the

war a man may have served two years, and he would extend his time for two years to make up a full four-year term. Another man enlisted for three years. He would extend it, adding to what he had already served enough to make it a four-year term.

Mr. STAFFORD. What benefit will he receive, if this paragraph is agreed to, by an extension of his term of enlistment?

Mr. PADGETT. He would get the benefit that the two services would be added together, and at the expiration of the four years the two together would be counted as a full term.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then this does not give him any benefit or increased pay by reason of enlistment.

Mr. PADGETT. Not when he now reenlists; but if at the expiration of the four years he reenlists he would get the benefit provided on a second enlistment.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman is certain that he will not receive any benefits by reason of reenlistment for this extended period when it does not exceed the four-year period?

Mr. PADGETT. We made that inquiry, and it was so stated.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS: Page 18, line 23, after the word "enlistment," insert as a new paragraph the following:

"In time of war or national emergency boards for the selection of officers of the Naval Reserve Force of and above the rank of lieutenant commander for promotion to the next higher grade or rank as now authorized by law shall be composed of not less than five officers of the Navy, senior in rank to the officers to be selected for promotion."

Mr. PADGETT. I reserve a point of order for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserves the point of order.

Mr. ROGERS. I wish the gentleman would reserve it long enough to permit me to state my case.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. My amendment is in the precise language of a recommendation made by Secretary Daniels to the House of Representatives, and by the Speaker transmitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs on, I think, the 11th of January, 1919. There are 990 Naval Reserve lieutenant commanders. Many of these men have been in the naval service since the outbreak of the war. Many of them have rendered extremely valuable service. A former Secretary of the Navy, now a Senator elect of the United States, is one of the 990. Not a single reserve lieutenant commander has been promoted to the rank of commander during the war.

The naval appropriation act for the current year, approved July 1, 1918, contains the following paragraph:

No officer of any class of the Naval Reserve force shall, in time of peace, be promoted above the grade of lieutenant commander, but in time of war or other national emergency officers of the Naval Reserve force of and above the rank of lieutenant commander in active service shall be eligible for selection for promotion to the next higher grade or rank by the same board of officers that select officers of the United States Navy for promotion to such higher ranks and grades, under the same rules and regulations as apply to the selection for promotion of officers of the United States Navy.

The Secretary of the Navy, in spite of that authorization in the naval appropriation act, has never taken advantage of the opportunity and has never caused to be examined for promotion a single Naval Reserve lieutenant commander. A selection board for the regular Navy met in July, 1918, but no reserve officers were considered for promotion. In August, 1918, the Bureau of Navigation notified the reserve officers by circular letter that selection boards for reserve officers of the rank of lieutenant commander would meet in January, 1919. In December, 1918, reserve lieutenant commanders were invited to submit any information which should be considered with reference to their promotion.

A selection board met last month and selected officers for the regular Navy, but the Secretary of the Navy declined to sign an order which would authorize the board to consider reserve officers.

Secretary Daniels has stated that the reason which led him to decline to allow that board to pass upon the promotion of reserve lieutenant commanders was that the board for promotion in the regular Navy which was made up of nine admirals was so very much overworked in considering regular Navy promotions that it had no time or opportunity to pass upon reserve promotions. And therefore the Secretary of the Navy in transmitting the exact language that I have just offered wrote to the Speaker of the House of Representatives as follows:

Attention is respectfully invited to the fact that the law quoted requires that the board for selection of officers for promotion in the Naval Reserve Force must be the same board of officers that selects officers of the regular Navy for promotion. The regular Navy selection board is required by law to be composed of nine rear admirals. This board is charged with the selection of officers for promotion in the higher grades of both the regular Navy and the Coast Guard.

The addition to the duties of the board of selection for promotion of officers of the higher grades in the Naval Reserve Force therefore adds an almost overwhelming amount of extra work on the board. All members of the regular board, as is natural and unavoidable, fill high administrative and executive positions and commands of the greatest importance. This addition to their duties of selection in the Naval Reserve Force in its practical working out makes it impracticable, if not impossible, for the members of the board to properly perform their regular duties, and under existing conditions will tend to threaten the efficiency of the Navy as a whole.

There is, therefore, inclosed herewith a proposed draft of a bill to authorize the appointment of a separate board for the selection of officers for promotion in the Naval Reserve Force; and in view of the patent urgency of this measure, as above set forth, it is requested that same be enacted, if practicable, before the close of the present session of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I have no information as to the reasons which led the committee to disregard the urgent recommendations of the Secretary of the Navy. Clearly, these lieutenant commanders of the reserve force, 1,000 in number, many of whom have been in the Navy and have done splendid service for a year and a half or two years, should be given an opportunity at least to present their case for promotion. There is not a single case of promotion up to this time. My amendment is in the words of the Secretary of the Navy, and creates another instrumentality which would allow meritorious lieutenant commanders of the reserve force to be promoted after proper hearing and investigation. I hope that the chairman of the committee will be induced to withdraw his reservation of a point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the law provides a remedy now—the same remedy provided for regular officers—nine admirals, six of whom must agree, but this is a provision to change it and substitute a different board of five officers, who instead of admirals shall be officers just above the grade of captain. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

The act of April 16, 1918 (Public No. 129), granting, under certain conditions, to every commissioned officer of the Army the right to quarters in kind for their dependents, or the authorized commutation therefor, including the allowances for heat and light, shall hereafter be construed to apply to officers of the Navy and Marine Corps only who are serving in the field as part of the American Expeditionary Forces under the jurisdiction of the War Department.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. Do these men get this allowance now?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. What is the necessity for the legislation?

Mr. PADGETT. This is the limitation upon the allowances under that act of October 6, I think it was, when there was a provision put in the law allowing commutation of quarters for officers who were serving, engaged in the war, and the Comptroller of the Treasury held that the Marine Corps and the Navy were entitled to the benefit of it. An officer who is serving at sea gets 10 per cent additional pay instead of commutation of quarters. Under that law he is getting the 10 per cent for sea service, and then he is getting the commutation of quarters in addition. This applies generally to the officers of the Navy and the Marine Corps and provides that it shall be cut down to those who are serving in the field in foreign service and not the men who were serving at sea here in the United States or across the waters back and forth. This provision will save about \$11,000,000, which otherwise under existing law would have to be paid in the way of commutation of quarters.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, it would save the \$11,000,000 if the men are not kept over there.

Mr. PADGETT. That is what the estimate is; that the service that will be performed and the number of officers who will get it will save about \$11,000,000.

Mr. WALSH. If they are kept in France.

Mr. PADGETT. No. Under existing law they get it whether they are in France or not in France.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman state that in time of peace the Marine Corps and the Navy officers are serving with the War Department?

Mr. PADGETT. No; the marines are serving with the War Department over there, and the Navy is not serving with the War Department.

Mr. WALSH. It provides that it shall hereafter be construed to apply to officers of the Navy and Marine Corps who are serving in the field as part of the American Expeditionary Forces under the jurisdiction of the War Department.

Mr. PADGETT. Those are the only ones who would get it hereafter, which comprise a very limited number, whereas all of them are getting it now.

Mr. WALSH. Of course they are getting it now because of this former act and because there is a war.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes. This provides that that act shall be construed to apply to this limited number and not to the whole of them.

Mr. WALSH. It must be rather a high limit if there is a saving of \$11,000,000.

Mr. PADGETT. It is. When you come to pay commutation of quarters for rooms and heat and light, it amounts to a heap of money.

Mr. WALSH. Does it embrace within its provisions any of the naval aviation force?

Mr. PADGETT. It includes everyone who is with the Navy who gets the benefit of it.

Mr. WALSH. I assume that it includes those that were included within it.

Mr. GARNER. Under that act everybody got the benefit of quarters and 10 per cent while at sea. Under this provision only those in France will get the benefit of it. That is the difference.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman from Texas has stated it very concisely and briefly, but I should like to know if this includes within its provisions officers of the naval aviation force who are in the Expeditionary Forces?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; the Navy does not separate officers. They are detailed to the aviation duty. The man may be serving in aviation to-day and be transferred to some other duty to-morrow or next month.

Mr. WALSH. Then, as I understand the gentleman, if this is permitted to become a law, it will save \$11,000,000 for the reasons stated by the gentleman, supplemented by the reasons stated by the gentleman from Texas, but it will only constitute that saving in the event that these officers are kept abroad as part of the Expeditionary Forces. There will not be any Expeditionary Force after they come home.

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. WALSH. There will not be any pay; it will not be any saving.

Mr. PADGETT. This is putting a limit during the fiscal year when the Navy is operating, and it saves it when he is here at home.

Mr. GARNER. It does not save anything while he is in France, but when he comes from France he can not have the 10 per cent and commutation both. There is the difference.

Mr. WALSH. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. GARNER. That is the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. WALSH. Those who are serving in the field as part of the American Expeditionary Force.

Mr. GARNER. That is the exception. The general law gives them, according to the Comptroller of the Treasury, and allows them 10 per cent while on sea duty, and also an allowance for commutation and quarters while on sea duty. They get both. This only makes exception of allowance and commutation to those people who are with the Expeditionary Force in France. None will get it when they come from France except those on sea duty.

Mr. WALSH. When they come from France, the American Expeditionary Forces, what will the saving be by reason of not having to pay this?

Mr. PADGETT. They would not get any then.

Mr. WALSH. Then there will be a further saving?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; they will save still more.

Mr. WALSH. How much?

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know.

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

The rates of pay prescribed in section 15 of an act entitled "An act to temporarily increase the commissioned and warrant and enlisted strength of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," approved May 22, 1917, are hereby made the permanent rates of pay of the enlisted men of the Navy.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, the whole thing about it is this: Sometime last year we passed the act of May 22 providing that during the war the pay of the Navy should be added to by \$15 a month to the fellow who got up to \$21 a month. I have the act here and I will read it:

That commencing June 1, 1917, and continuing until not later than six months after the termination of the present war, all enlisted men of the Navy of the United States in active service whose base pay does not exceed \$21 per month shall receive an increase of \$15 per month; those whose base pay is over \$21 and does not exceed \$24 a month, an increase of \$12 per month; those whose base pay is over \$24 and less than \$45 per month, an increase of \$8 per month; and those whose base pay is \$45 or more per month, an increase of \$60 per annum: Provided—

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the substantive part of it.

Mr. PADGETT. This simply makes it permanent pay of the Navy.

Mr. STAFFORD. Under existing law, which the gentleman has just read, the pay will continue for at least six months after the termination of the war?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. STAFFORD. That will be well into the next fiscal year. The seamen now enlisted in the service will receive those rates of pay. If we grant this increase, a permanent increase, it will naturally affect the policy of the War Department. I think it is far better, in view of the fact that their pay is secure for nearly a year hence, when Congress will be in possession of full information as to what should be the permanent pay of the enlisted men in the Army and also the seamen in the Navy, that it should be deferred, and therefore I make the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. Before the gentleman makes the point of order I want to say I do not believe that if you make the point of order, and that remains the pay, you can get men to enlist in the Navy at the present pay.

Mr. STAFFORD. Why, the present pay is that which is now prescribed by law.

Mr. PADGETT. Here a man comes along and enlists for four years, and if his pay will drop down \$15 in three or four months from now he will not enlist.

Mr. BUTLER. Now, Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit me, please?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. WALSH. The point of order has been sustained.

Mr. BUTLER. This is talking after the thing has happened.

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. BUTLER. We all want to insist on young men who belong to us and the people we represent coming out of this Navy. But we must have other men to take their places, as the Chairman has said to-day. We will not, in my judgment, be able to enlist these men to take the places of the young men we are now endeavoring to have released from the service unless we increase this pay.

Mr. PADGETT. They are turning them out by the wholesale, and you are going to have a barren Navy.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman realizes—

Mr. BUTLER. I know it will cost a good deal of money.

Mr. STAFFORD (continuing). It prescribes virtually the pay of the Army, and yet the gentleman has not conferred with the Committee on Military Affairs at all as to what the pay should be. For the present I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has sustained the point of order two or three times. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Section 1 of the act entitled "An act to increase the number of midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy," approved December 20, 1917, is hereby amended so as to read as follows: That hereafter there shall be allowed at the United States Naval Academy five midshipmen for each Senator, Representative, Delegate in Congress, and Resident Commissioner from Porto Rico, and five for the District of Columbia, 15 appointed each year at large, and 100 appointed annually from enlisted men of the Navy, as now authorized by law.

Mr. STAFFORD. I reserve a point of order. What is the necessity for this authorization?

Mr. PADGETT. Just a question of fairness. Under existing law each Senator, Representative, and Delegate in Congress is entitled to five midshipmen at the Naval Academy. Porto Rico is entitled to only one, and the District of Columbia to two. It occurred to us that it was entirely fair that the District of Columbia, that has as many people as any congressional district, or more, should have as much representation as a congressional district, and Porto Rico should have as much representation as Hawaii or Alaska or the others. And to that extent it changes existing law.

Mr. BUTLER. Just for the two places?

Mr. PADGETT. That is all. It gives the District of Columbia five instead of two; it gives Porto Rico five instead of one, and puts them on an equality with the congressional districts of the country.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] permit me to ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question?

Mr. STAFFORD. I shall be delighted.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Did I understand the gentleman to say that each congressional district was entitled to have five appointees?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir.

Mr. DUPRÉ. How are they prorated?

Mr. PADGETT. Whenever you have a vacancy you have the right to fill it. If you have five vacancies you appoint them all at once, and if you have one you just appoint for that one. You have to keep five there all the time.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I would like to know if there is any sort of prorate in the way of districts whereby this matter is handled?

Mr. PADGETT. None at all. Whenever you have a vacancy you have a right to make an appointment.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Did I understand the gentleman from Tennessee to say that the practice is that he may withhold his appointment and then throw five at a time on Admiral Eberle, or on the new superintendent?

Mr. PADGETT. Admiral Scales.

Mr. DUPRÉ. Are you going to throw five at Admiral Scales at one time?

Mr. PADGETT. I fill them as they occur.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I do that, too, but I would like to know how the thing is worked, if the gentleman has time to explain.

Mr. PADGETT. Whenever there is a vacancy you make an appointment. If you would appoint five at once, and none of them died, resigned, or dropped out, you would not have another appointment until they graduated.

Mr. DUPRÉ. I am very glad to find out how you are advised about these vacancies.

Mr. PADGETT. I always fill mine, and I would advise you to fill yours.

Mr. DUPRÉ. How is a Member of Congress advised of these five vacancies?

Mr. PADGETT. As they happen he gets notice from the Bureau of Navigation. They send him a letter telling him of the vacancy, and send him a nomination blank on which to nominate the young man whom he wishes to appoint.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Calvin Willard Gilfillan is hereby authorized, and permitted to take the examination for the Naval Academy in February, 1919, and, on satisfactorily passing the examination and being otherwise qualified, to enter the academy at the usual time in 1919.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts reserves a point of order.

Mr. WALSH. This is rather an unusual provision.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it is a rather unusual case. I will explain the circumstances.

Up until last year, some time in 1918, the law was to the effect that in the case of nominations to Annapolis by Members of Congress—Senators and Representatives—candidates must be not less than 16 years nor more than 20 at the date of taking their examination. Now, then, they were holding two examinations a year, the first one in February and the second one in April, about the third week in April, somewhere about the 20th. Last May, I think it was, we passed an act changing the law, providing that the candidates must be not less than 16 years old nor more than 20 on the 1st day of April of the year in which they are to enter the academy, fixing the time at a definite date.

At the time of the passage of that act this young man had been nominated to Annapolis; he had gone to a preparatory school, and was attending a preparatory school in order to enter. If the law had not been changed he could take the February examination and would be within the prescribed age, but as the date was changed from the time of taking the examination to a fixed date he was 15 days too old on the 1st of April, so that had the law not been changed after his nomination he could have taken the examination in February and would have been within the age limit. But the law being changed, making it the 20th day of April, he became 20 years of age about the 15th or 16th of March, so that he became 15 days too old by virtue of this change of law after he had been nominated, when he was preparing to take the examination and expecting to take it. There is only one case, and none other can arise under the law.

Mr. WALSH. Where is he from?

Mr. PADGETT. From the State of Texas. He was nominated by Mr. McLEMORE.

Mr. WALSH. When will he take the examination?

Mr. PADGETT. This coming February.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman says this is the only case. When this special act was under consideration, as the gentleman will recall, on its first presentation I pointed out the very condition which has arisen.

Mr. PADGETT. I changed it to a later date.

Mr. STAFFORD. And the second time it was called to the attention of the gentleman I stated that it would affect other young men, who would be deprived by reason of age from availing of the opportunity of taking the examination if they reached the required age on the second Tuesday of February.

Mr. PADGETT. It can not occur again.

Mr. STAFFORD. There may be many others of these young men similarly situated.

Mr. GARNER. Undoubtedly if there were many others Members of Congress would know about it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Perhaps Members of Congress would say to their constituents, writing to them about it, that the law had been changed, and that they are barred.

Mr. WALSH. I recall having made such a statement in my correspondence.

Mr. STAFFORD. It would bar them.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not see how it could.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman think this is the proper language to accomplish what he seeks to do for this young man from Texas?

Mr. PADGETT. I think so. I submitted it to the Secretary of the Navy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. WALSH. I still further reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PADGETT. I submitted it to the Secretary of the Navy, and he replied that he had no objection to it and approved the language.

Mr. WALSH. Well, there is only one gentleman of that name in the United States, and possibly that is right. What is meant by the language on page 20, line 1, "on satisfactory passing the examination"?

Mr. PADGETT. He must pass the examination, just as anyone else has to do.

Mr. WALSH. Is there any such thing as an unsatisfactory passage of the examination?

Mr. TILSON. The gentleman used the wrong word. It should be "satisfactorily."

Mr. WALSH. The word ought to be "satisfactorily," but I can not understand why you say "satisfactory passing the examination" if he passes it.

Mr. BARKLEY. He may pass the literary examination, and he might be found deficient on the physical examination.

Mr. PADGETT. The word "satisfactory" is perhaps surplus there, but it does not change anything.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts insist on his point of order?

Mr. WALSH. I am inclined to withdraw the point of order; but I think if the gentleman thinks this is the only case he is mistaken, because I have no doubt many Members have had young men write them who have been nominated or wanted to be nominated and prepare for this examination. Somehow or other this young man from Texas is the only one who has had his case brought to the attention of the Naval Affairs Committee, and we are going to legislate him into the Naval Academy, because that is what it amounts to.

Mr. PADGETT. This young man had been nominated and his nomination had been approved, and he had received papers from the Bureau of Navigation permitting him to take the examination this coming February.

Mr. WALSH. Before the law was passed?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; before the law was passed; and then he found himself 15 days too old.

Mr. GARNER. He had a good case. The date in this provision ought to be changed from February to April, because you are not going to pass this law in time for the February examination.

Mr. WALSH. Well, I do not know. The Secretary of the Interior went ahead with some miners recently, and entered into some moral obligations in anticipation of the passage of a law. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. PADGETT. There is a difference in the print of the bill. In the bill that I have before me the word in line 1, page 20, is "satisfactorily." In the other print it is "satisfactory." I move to strike out the word "satisfactory" and substitute the word "satisfactorily."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, line 1, strike out the word "satisfactory" and insert "satisfactorily."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out in line 1, page 20, the word "February" and inserting in lieu thereof the word "April." This bill will not become a law so that this boy can take this examination in February.

Mr. PADGETT. That is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, line 1, strike out the word "February" and insert in lieu thereof the word "April."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I desire to discuss the amendment. Of course, we are given to understand that when the ship of state makes its voyage from the shores of sunny France back to the United States, it will very shortly thereafter turn around and hie itself again to foreign shores. Now, if we change this to April, the Executive who has to sign the act may be abroad, and the courier who may be sent abroad with the necessary papers and fountain pens for the signature to be affixed may not get there until after the date of the examination. As long as you have made an exception, why not give this young man from Texas a little further time and set the date of his examination at July 4?

Mr. PADGETT. This bill must become a law before the 4th of March or it will not become a law at all.

Mr. GARNER. July 4 would undoubtedly be in keeping with the boy's patriotism.

Mr. WALSH. And it would be a monument to the patriotism and industry of the gentleman who got the paragraph inserted into the naval bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment on my own responsibility. This is not a committee amendment, but it is a matter that was sent down to me within the last day, or two. I have not had an opportunity to submit it to the committee. I will make an explanation of it after it is read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, after line 3, insert:

"That hereafter chief machinists, when their total length of service as machinists, warrant machinists, and chief machinists is equal to or more than 12 years, and chief pay clerks, when their total active service as paymasters' clerks, pay clerks, and chief pay clerks, is equal to or more than 12 years, and chief pharmacists, when their total length of service as pharmacists and chief pharmacists is equal to or more than 12 years, shall receive the pay and allowances of a lieutenant (junior grade), and when their total active service is equal to or more than 18 years they shall receive the pay and allowances of a lieutenant."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. PADGETT. I think it was in the act of August 29, 1916, that we provided that warrant officers should receive, after 12 years, the pay of a lieutenant, junior grade, and after 18 years the pay of a lieutenant, the service to be from the date of commission. It happens that in the case of chief machinists, chief pay clerks, and pharmacists, they were not given commissioned grades until a number of years after other warrant officers were given them, so that we have some warrant officers who are given this pay 12 years from date of commission and 18 years from date of commission, while in these ranks men who have been serving 26 years will still have to serve two more years before they get it, because this commissioned rank was not created until later. A gentleman from Pennsylvania came in to see me the other day who has been serving 26 years. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] was present.

Mr. BUTLER. Yes. This man has been serving 26 years.

Mr. PADGETT. And he would have to serve two more years before he would get it, because the existing law provides that it shall be 12 years from the date of commission. These ratings were provided for about six years after it had provided for other ratings, and it discriminated against the three ratings in the warrant ranks.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this subject of granting consideration to men by reason of back service, and giving a commission, has been up here several times from the Naval Affairs Committee. I am informed by a member of the committee that this matter has never been submitted to the full committee.

Mr. PADGETT. I so stated as fully as I could.

Mr. BUTLER. But the committee has talked about it.

Mr. PADGETT. We reported two years ago a provision which we thought covered the whole matter, but by making it read "date of commission" instead of "date of warrant" it cuts out the long-term men who had been serving for years before the commission rank was created. The men who come in in other ratings who had commissions granted in these ratings six years before, got the benefit of this pay although they have served years less than these men.

Mr. STAFFORD. I recall last year the gentleman reported a bill providing for that kind of service, and now he is bringing in an amendment that has not received the consideration of the full committee. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

ORDNANCE AND ORDNANCE STORES: For procuring, producing, preserving, and handling ordnance material; for the armament of ships; for fuel, material, and labor to be used in the general work of the Ordnance

Department; for furniture at naval ammunition depots, torpedo stations, naval ordnance plants, and proving grounds; for necessary improvements at and maintenance of proving grounds, powder factory, torpedo stations, gun factory, ammunition depots, and naval ordnance plants, and for target practice; for the maintenance, repair, or operation of horse-drawn and motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles, to be used only for official purposes at naval ammunition depots, naval proving grounds, naval ordnance plants, and naval torpedo stations, and for the pay of chemists, clerical, drafting, inspection, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, and naval ammunition depots: *Provided*, That the sum to be paid out of this appropriation under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy for chemists, clerical, drafting, inspection, watchmen, and messenger service in navy yards, naval stations, naval ordnance plants, and naval ammunition depots for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, shall not exceed \$2,000,000; in all, \$30,000,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. PADGETT. What is the gentleman's point of order? This is the regular appropriation for the work of the Bureau of Ordnance; there is nothing new in it and no change of language or purpose; it is the working appropriation of the Bureau of Ordnance.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman says there is nothing new in it. Does the existing law contain the language "naval ordnance plants"?

Mr. PADGETT. No; that is the change of a word. The present language is "an armor and projectile plant." That is a building being built at Charleston, W. Va. It is just a change of name to ordnance plants from armor and projectile plants. It is a name better suited to it.

Mr. WALSH. I notice here it says "for the maintenance, repair, or operation of horse-drawn and motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles to be used only for official purposes in the naval ammunition depots, naval proving grounds, naval ordnance plants, and naval torpedo stations." Is there any regulation or pronouncement on the part of the naval department as to what constitutes "official purposes" for the use of automobiles which are bought by the score and operated by men in the service?

Mr. PADGETT. Only by men in the service when engaged in the work—

Mr. WALSH. Of riding in them.

Mr. PADGETT. On official business. For instance, in the navy yards, going from one place to another on official business and not social.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the reservation of a point of order and move to strike out the last word. I would like to get the gentleman's views on that phase of the question. He states that in using the automobiles they do not use them socially. Does the gentleman think that the use of a Government automobile by a naval officer, driven by an enlisted man or chauffeur in the service, attending theaters, dinner parties, and dances after hours, is making use of that machine for official purposes?

Mr. PADGETT. I think not.

Mr. WALSH. I am sure that such a practice does not meet with the approval of the chairman of this committee.

Mr. PADGETT. It does not, and I have not heard of anything of that kind in the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. Nor has the gentleman observed it?

Mr. PADGETT. No; and the Secretary has issued orders prescribing that they must be used strictly for official purposes and that a violation of them would subject the offender to court-martial.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; but, of course, it is a fact that the Navy automobiles are not labeled with large letters in the manner of those used by the War Department.

Mr. PADGETT. I understand that they are lettered with letters an inch and a half in size.

Mr. BUTLER. I thought they were 4 inches.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman must have been using his long-distance glasses if he saw letters 4 inches high.

Mr. PADGETT. The committee understood that they were all marked in that way.

Mr. WALSH. Sometimes it is difficult to tell, where a machine is not marked, and you see it driven by a naval officer—operated by apparently a man in the naval service—whether it is the property of the Government or not.

Mr. PADGETT. I understand that all of the machines belonging to the Government in possession of the Navy are marked in large letters. A great many naval officers own their own machines and ride in them.

Mr. WALSH. Has the gentleman seen any of those machines about Washington with Navy marks upon them?

Mr. PADGETT. I have not looked; I do not know.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman, I believe, is shortsighted.

Mr. PADGETT. I have not seen them; I do not know.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad, touching upon this subject covered in this paragraph, that the Secretary of the Navy, or the authorities having these machines in charge, has issued strict orders that they shall be used only for official purposes, because we all know that in other branches of the service these machines are not being used upon official business only, and are being used for pleasure, and that they are being used in ways that ought not to get the approval of those authorities having the machines in their custody and control.

Mr. PADGETT. Permit me to read to the gentleman the part of an official order signed by the Hon. Franklin D. Roosevelt, Acting Secretary of War:

Noncompliance with these instructions shall be regarded as disobedience of orders and a misuse and application of Government property. The department further directs that immediate steps be taken to place the following legend in appropriate letters on both front doors of each Government-owned car, letters to be in a contrasting color to the car color and not less than 1½ inches high:

"This car is used for official Government business only."

The department, in bringing this letter to the notice of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, which has cognizance of the purchase and operation of the motor vehicles, has directed that suitable steps be taken to see that this order is carefully and fully observed.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. The appropriation for ordnance and ordnance stores as recommended by the committee is \$30,000,000, in all \$522,000 less than that carried in last year's bill.

Mr. PADGETT. There was a deficiency of \$11,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. With the deficiency of \$11,000,000, making it \$11,000,000 less for the coming fiscal year than in war times. All through this bill the appropriations for the fiscal year are comparable with and approach the appropriations carried in the last naval appropriation bill, and they are usually three and four times the amount of the appropriations that were provided in the bill of the year before, when we were on a peace basis. In this item two years ago we appropriated \$6,204,000. There may have been some deficiency appropriation, but that in large numbers was the amount carried during peace times. We are carrying throughout this bill now virtually the appropriations which were carried when we were at war. I had thought that if in anything we had stored up property as a result of preparedness during the year and six months we were at war, it was in ordnance and ordnance stores.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, this is not for the shooting part of it. This is the operating part, the maintenance, the upkeep of the ships.

Mr. STAFFORD. The very first sentence in the paragraph provides for procuring, producing, preserving, and handling ordnance material.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I will read a part of a letter. I asked the Secretary about it. The letter says:

Although in my hearings I stated it was the intention of the department during the next fiscal year to keep in full commission about 16 battleships from the *South Carolina* down, yet there will be ordnance work in the way of labor and materials required on 32 battleships. It is contemplated that this appropriation will have to care for the upkeep in ordnance of 150 destroyers, 23 cruisers, 8 armored cruisers, 32 battleships, 37 gunboats, 87 submarines, 5 transports, 50 subchasers.

The item of labor alone that was estimated in the various navy yards in working on the production of guns and gun carriages, and so forth, was estimated by the bureau chiefs at \$30,000,000. They submitted an estimate of \$53,000,000, but the committee has reduced it to \$30,000,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Originally they had \$75,000,000 in the estimates.

Mr. PADGETT. I understand; but I am talking about the revised estimates.

Mr. STAFFORD. That estimate was predicated upon continuing in war.

Mr. PADGETT. Talking about conditions before the war, we have three or four times as many ships to take care of and repair and upkeep in ordnance and ordnance materials and supplies. This is not for powder.

Mr. STAFFORD. This appropriation and its growth only exemplifies what we may expect if we are going to pursue the extravagant policy as recommended by the committee, true, with a string attached to it, whereby it has been estimated that in 1924 this country will be burdened with a charge of \$750,000,000 for the maintenance of that program.

Why, if we continue on this policy, Mr. Chairman, there will be such a burden upon the present generation that they will not be able to shake off the yoke. We talked of going into this war for the purpose of civilization, and yet, by reason of this heavy load upon the shoulders of humanity which you are proposing in this bill, you are loading down humanity so they are going to quake until some time there may be such a protest that they will sweep everything before them. Talk about this great program in time of peace? We went into the war in

order to escape from the burdens of the armaments of European countries, and now, when we thought there was a ray of sunshine and we would be relieved of those great burdens here in the territory of the United States, isolated as we are and protected as we are from foreign assaults, we have taken upon us the yoke of militarism from which the peoples of the Old World have tried to free themselves for the last half century. That is the message of this bill.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment—page 21, line 2, strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$1,000,000" and strike out "\$30,000,000" and insert "\$29,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment. The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, line 2, strike out "\$2,000,000" and insert "\$1,000,000" and strike out "\$30,000,000" and insert "\$29,000,000."

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, before I discuss this I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if this \$2,000,000 item does not cover the laboratory of the gas experimental station? Where is that located?

Mr. PADGETT. No; that does not relate to that at all. This is ordnance, for pay of clerks—

Mr. WINGO. No; pay of chemists.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; in connection with the production and analysis of powder—

Mr. WINGO. But where is that laboratory?

Mr. PADGETT. We have not any. Those are the yards.

Mr. WINGO. Where in the gentleman's bill does he take care of the experimental gas station?

Mr. PADGETT. There is nothing in here about the experimental gas station.

Mr. WINGO. The Navy had one and the initial appropriation for it when established was \$200,000, so I was informed. You have a plant that was down east of here; where is it and how do you carry it in this bill, in what item?

Mr. PADGETT. We have an experimental station down at Annapolis, with an appropriation of \$160,000, I think it is, that is under the Bureau of Steam Engineering, which comes in a little later on.

Mr. WINGO. Well, it is more than that. Here is what I am trying to get at. The Navy has a station where they are investigating explosives and gases for the Navy. That is comparable to the experimental station out here at the university that was taken from the Bureau of Mines and turned over to the Army. That is the kind of plant I am trying to locate in the gentleman's bill.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know of any particular place of that kind.

Mr. WINGO. Well, the gentleman will remember—

Mr. PADGETT. There was an appropriation several years ago for the erection of a large experimental station which cost about a million and a half or two million dollars.

Mr. WINGO. As I now recollect, about the time we went into the war the Appropriations Committee included an item of \$200,000 for this station, for the purchase of land and starting an experimental station on the same line of work that they are doing at the university. Now, I may be misinformed—

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know.

Mr. WINGO. I looked the matter up—

Mr. PADGETT. This \$2,000,000 is to pay for the clerical force in all of these yards and naval stations and could not be reduced. It is not an additional appropriation.

Mr. WINGO. I will state to the gentleman, while I am on this subject—I will withdraw my amendment—that, while I have raised the question, I will give the gentleman what I had in mind, then possibly he can locate the provision in the bill.

I have been informed that this is the situation. A short time before we went into the war we had a fine gas experimental station out here at the university that they called the University Experiment Station, under the control of the Bureau of Mines. It seems that the gentlemen in charge of the Bureau of Mines were men of vision, and they came to the conclusion that it would be something remarkable if we kept out of the war. So six months before we went into the war they commenced experimenting in gases, and they conducted some very successful experiments. And finally, after they had perfected and made such wonderful progress, the President made an order that took that gas experimental station out of the hands of the Bureau of Mines and vested it in the Gas Division of the Army, with Gen. Sibert at the head.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know of anything of that kind.

Mr. WINGO. I understand that recently the Army—and I have not had a chance to investigate it since I received this information, but I am going to do it—wanted to do away with

this plant out here, and they proposed dismantling it, and asked for an appropriation to establish a new station, just as I thought, from the information that I received, the Navy had asked.

Mr. PADGETT. I do not know of any the Navy had.

Mr. WINGO. I am trying to investigate this matter, and when the military bill comes up I am going to oppose the establishment of a new plant. I am going to be in favor of turning back that work to the Bureau of Mines, for this reason: If you have a separate plant for the Navy and a separate plant for the Army, doing the same kind of work, you will necessarily restrict these experiments to two different lines, or, rather, to one line, and that will be along military lines—military explosives and gases—but if you maintain the old station you had and conduct the old experiments that were being carried on, which were not only of value from a military standpoint but from a scientific standpoint, this Government, pursuing its policy, will certainly maintain an experimental station for scientific purposes.

I thought it would be the part of economy if you had one station that conducted the experiments with these gases and explosives that could do the investigating not only for scientific but for military purposes; and I am opposed to turning it over to the Army, opposed to turning the matter over to the Navy, because you will have an extravagant expenditure of money, that will be limited to only one branch of the investigation. Those experiments carried on out there—as you know, who have investigated it, and those who have not if you will take the time to investigate it—by that establishment won the admiration of the scientific world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Chairman, I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent for three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINGO. They got the cooperation of the leading scientists and men in the laboratories of the leading universities of the United States, and they rendered a great service to humanity, and during that six months they perfected and brought the gases that were used by our Army up to a high state of perfection. And that experiment station is entitled to all the credit for the work that was done, because their plant and their experiments were taken over after they had performed the labor and achieved the success. So the gas division was given a perfected plant with plans all perfected. I think it ought to be turned back to the same management.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WINGO. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman know it has been recommended that the Chemical Warfare Service be abolished in the Army, and that only an appropriation for the experimenting and testing of such gases as that is going to be asked for by the Army?

Mr. WINGO. They proposed to abolish this out here, and then go and buy land and establish a new experimental station, which would be the height of folly. I have been told that when they got ready to dismantle out here they overlooked the fact that they did not own the land and were going to sell the land there. I do not know what authority they had to sell it, anyway. As a matter of fact, the gas division ought to be abolished. They proposed to take out to the ocean and dump all the TNT. One Army officer said that that would be a useless waste; that that stuff could be utilized in this country for domestic operations.

Finally they abandoned that proposition. If you turn this over to the Army they will look at it from a military standpoint. I say this not with any reflection upon the Army officers. Their training has been such that they do not look at it from the commercial or scientific standpoint, but only from the military standpoint. You should put it back into the Bureau of Mines, and not establish two separate plants, one for the Army and one for the Navy. If you do, you will have to spend on each one of them each year more than it will cost to maintain the plant out here that you already have.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. DYER. I do so, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of getting a little information. Will the chairman of the committee state as to the probable number of civil-service employees, if any, who are employed under the Bureau of Ordnance?

Mr. PADGETT. No; I can not. This takes in, you see, every navy yard in the country—New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Norfolk, Portsmouth, Newport News, the torpedo factory, and

Columbia, S. C., and New Orleans, and Key West and Pensacola, Fla., and Mare Island, Cal.

Mr. DYER. As a matter of fact, a great many of these men are employed in those places, and an immense number of them are enrolled in the civil service, are they not?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, sir. And the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation limits the number that can be employed, and this is just a limitation on the amount that can be paid out of this sum.

Mr. DYER. Well, the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill contains a provision to the effect that former employees under the civil service who have resigned their positions to enter the military service shall be put back in their positions.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. DYER. That rule would not apply to these employees, would it, in the opinion of the chairman?

Mr. PADGETT. I think it would; and the department wants to take them all back, where they can get them, where they are experienced and trained men. They hated to give them up.

Mr. DYER. I will say to the gentleman that some of them have been having serious trouble in getting back.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to offer, at the end of this paragraph, an amendment similar to the one which I offered and which was put on the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill and also to the deficiency appropriation bill, with reference to men of that character.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DYER] withdraws the pro forma amendment and offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 2, page 21, insert:

Provided, That no part of any appropriation herein shall be used unless all former Government employees who have been drafted or enlisted in the military service of the United States in the war with Germany shall be reinstated on application to their former positions appropriated for herein if they have received an honorable discharge and are qualified to perform the duties of the positions."

Mr. PADGETT. For the present, Mr. Chairman, I will reserve a point of order on that amendment.

Mr. DYER. Well, Mr. Chairman, I will say to the gentleman that this is the same amendment that was presented twice and was favorably ruled upon in the committee.

Mr. PADGETT. I see that it is a limitation. Go ahead.

Mr. DYER. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order is withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the point of order withdrawn?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DYER. I want to call attention to this fact: We put this provision into the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, and the Senate committee has reported that bill to the Senate with a provision substantially like that of the House, but much stronger, in my judgment, and stronger than we could put it in here under our rules on account of its being subject to a point of order. The Senate committee has changed it so as to provide that all former Government employees who were drafted or enlisted in the military service of the United States in the war with Germany shall be reinstated on application to their former positions if they have received an honorable discharge and are qualified to perform the duties of their positions. They have reported it making it mandatory upon all the department heads. If that is written into the law as the Senate committee has presented it—and I have no doubt it will pass the Senate in that form—I feel sure the conferees on the part of the House will accept it, because it will end the conditions we have had during the past, in my judgment, with reference to these matters. A great many soldiers and sailors who entered this war and who were civil-service employees either here in Washington or elsewhere on returning have found their positions filled, and when applying for reinstatement have been told that there is no position open to them, and the result is that they have had to cling to their only hope, which was the order issued extending the time to five years in which they could apply for reinstatement.

In other words, they have been told that they could go out and find a place if they could, and that they would be put back. Now, this Senate amendment makes it mandatory upon the executive to put these men back into their positions. I have had a number of cases of this kind. Here is a letter which is a sample of complaints that I have received and I include in my remarks. It is as follows:

Referring to letter from the Civil Service Commission addressed to you and which you forwarded to me, wherein the commission refers to the fact that the War Department and its various offices are undoubtedly entirely filled up with clerical workers, and stating that I had the

privilege of entering any other department of the civil service where there were vacancies. In this connection, Mr. DYER, I wish to thank you for the efforts you extended in my behalf and incidentally to inquire as to whether or not further action can be taken.

The Quartermaster General's office also returned my request for reinstatement to me, containing practically the same information as the Civil Service Commission apparently gave you. For instance, the Quartermaster General's office suggests that I communicate with all the different zone supply officers in the country, stating my qualifications, etc., and if a request comes to them for my reinstatement from any zone they will gladly approve same. Now, Mr. DYER, doesn't this appear on the face of it a most absurd and impossible suggestion; first, because I have no way of ascertaining where the various zone supply officers are located, and, second, as I have learned from past experience, if I were fortunate enough to personally know any officer from the grade of, say, captain up, who perchance might be located in any zone, then, I say, I should experience no difficulty in getting placed; but unfortunately I do not possess this information. This would in particular apply to the zone supply office located at St. Louis, Mo. Then, too, if the zone supply office in St. Louis could take on clerical workers and later on transfer them to various zones who had made requests upon this zone for men, why did not they do it in my case? This I know absolutely they have done. Further, if such transfers are being made from zone to zone, why does not the Quartermaster General acquaint himself with these needs, and doing so he would not have to turn down the request of an experienced employee in Quartermaster Corps work? The Government asks cooperation from corporations all over the country in replacing returned soldiers, yet they do not require cooperation from their various departments. Col. Williams states to me that there is no vacancy, yet since I have put in my request for reinstatement over 200 men have been taken on in various capacities at this zone supply office located in St. Louis.

Nor does the Civil Service Commission offer me but little more encouragement. If the Civil Service Commission is aware of the fact that the various departments of the War Department are filled up, why do not they suggest my name being placed on an eligible list to the secretary of this ninth civil-service district for call to fill any vacancy that might occur in this district in any civil-service capacity? As I stated on my application for civil-service examination, I was willing to go anywhere, but, of course, preferred the district of Missouri; however, if not in Missouri, then, of course, anywhere, as I took this examination with a view of remaining in the civil service and not merely for the very good salaries they were compelled to offer in competing with civil corporations during war times.

I submit this for your information, Mr. DYER, and in the hope that you might be able to advise me further; also, that I may be successful in again becoming a civil-service employee.

Mr. PADGETT. Let me suggest to the gentleman that instead of putting it in as a limitation on an appropriation he offer it as a piece of legislation directing that it be done, instead of doing it by indirection.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman agree to this language: To strike out the words "no part of any appropriation herein shall be used unless" and make it read, *"Provided, That all former Government employees,"* and so forth?

Mr. PADGETT. That is what I am suggesting.

Mr. DYER. I am glad to have that suggestion.

Mr. PADGETT. I never like to do things by indirection.

Mr. DYER. My amendment was offered in that form only for the purpose of making it in order.

Mr. PADGETT. I understand that.

Mr. DYER. I ask unanimous consent to strike out the words "that no part of any appropriation herein shall be used unless."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment as suggested. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. And I ask unanimous consent that further on down the words "appropriated for herein" may be stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, these words will be stricken out. The question is on the amendment as modified.

Mr. WALSH. Let us have the amendment as modified reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modified amendment offered by Mr. DYER: Page 21, at the end of line 2, insert:

"Provided, That all former Government employees who have been drafted or enlisted in the military service of the United States in the war with Germany shall be reinstated on application to their former positions if they have received an honorable discharge and are qualified to perform the duties of the position."

Mr. CURRY of California. Mr. Chairman, section 9 of the civil-service law provides that not more than two members of one family may be employed anywhere in the civil service of the Federal Government. That section did not originally apply to the employees of the navy yards, but the mechanics, laborers, and clerks in the navy yards were by Executive order placed under the provisions of section 9 several years ago. Now, there are probably 200 or 300 employees of the Mare Island Navy Yard and the Benicia Arsenal who have gone into the Army and Navy of the United States. Their places probably have been filled by others than members of their own families, but I know of a number of instances where two members of the family of a man in the Army or Navy are at the present time employed under the civil service of the Federal Government. I should like to

know if this amendment would provide for the reinstatement of those soldiers and sailors who gave up their remunerative jobs to go into the Army and Navy to fight for their country without one of their relatives being required to resign or being discharged from their civil-service position?

Mr. PADGETT. That is what this provides.

Mr. CURRY of California. I have tried to have the navy yards taken out from under the provisions of this section 9, but have received no reply from the Navy Department as yet. I would like to have this amendment positively cover those cases.

Mr. PADGETT. This would cover the cases of the men who are in the military service, but it would not cover the case of two in a family. If two members of a family had left the civil service to enter the military service they would put the two of them back; but if a new one has gone in to take the place of a soldier, the soldier coming back might put the other man out. I do not know what the provision of the civil-service law is, and I would not want to undertake by an amendment on the naval bill to change the general civil-service law without knowing what its purpose, context, and application are. The effect of this is to take back the soldier who gave up his job and is now coming back and wants it.

Mr. CURRY of California. Yes; but the two members of the soldier's family are, perhaps, on the job given up by the soldier. They are employed by the Government under the civil-service laws of the United States. Are you going to discharge one of them to give the soldier back his job or are you going to keep him?

Mr. PADGETT. This does not affect the civil-service law. This puts the man back on his job, which he gave up to go into the war.

Mr. CURRY of California. I would like to amend the amendment, Mr. Chairman, by inserting at the end of the amendment the words "Section 9 of the civil-service law shall not apply to such cases nor to the members of the family of soldiers and sailors who are at the present time employed under the civil service of the United States."

Mr. PADGETT. I make a point of order against that as not relevant and not pertinent.

Mr. CURRY of California. I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that he can not make the point of order against that unless he makes it against the whole amendment.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes, I can.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CURRY of California offers an amendment to the amendment, as follows:

"At the end of the amendment insert: 'Section 9 of the civil-service law shall not apply to such cases, nor to the members of the families of soldiers and sailors at present employed by the United States.'"

Mr. PADGETT. I make a point of order that that is not germane.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he thinks the word "military" will be construed in its broad signification or whether it will be held to include the Army and not the Navy?

Mr. PADGETT. I suppose it will be construed in its broad sense. It might be well to add "military, naval, and marine."

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer an amendment?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. PADGETT: After the word "military" insert the words "or naval."

Mr. SCOTT of Michigan. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if he thinks this amendment would include the Coast Guard Service?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; it would include them, because in the war they are in the naval service.

Mr. HUMPHREYS. Would it include the marines?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. DYER. I am quite sure on investigation that the word "military" would cover both branches of the service, but I have no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment as amended.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask unanimous consent to insert in lieu of the words "being drafted or enlisted" the words "who have entered."

This might not be construed to include officers and we want to provide for men who have been commissioned as well as those who have entered the service otherwise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to modify his amendment by striking out the words "being drafted or enlisted in" and insert in lieu thereof the words "who have entered."

The Clerk reported the modified amendment, as follows:

Strike out the words "being drafted or enlisted in" and insert in lieu thereof the words "who have entered."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification of the amendment?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, do I understand the purpose is to provide for cases of officers who may leave the military service?

Mr. DYER. This is to provide for anyone who has entered the service and has been honorably discharged.

Mr. WALSH. Are there some officers who want to get out of the military service?

Mr. DYER. I have a number who have been trying to get out.

Mr. WALSH. That is a hopeful sign.

Mr. STAFFORD. I do not know whether we ought to adopt the amendment proposed by the gentleman. There are many instances which have been called to the attention of the committees of Congress where persons filling civilian positions in the War Department were given majorships, and even higher positions, merely for the purpose of increasing their pay, while continuing to perform civilian duties. Certainly the gentleman does not intend to allow those men to revert back to their original positions. The purpose of the gentleman's amendment originally was to provide for enlisted men.

Mr. DYER. Absolutely; but some men have been officers, and they gave up their positions, and if they go back and are ready to accept their civilian positions, and are qualified, at the same salary, I do not think there should be any objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Anyone who enlisted and rose to a commission naturally would be taken care of under the original phraseology of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DYER. That is true.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the modification of the gentleman from Missouri? The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, let me see if we can not reach some agreement in regard to reading further. Suppose we read to the top of the next page and then I move to rise?

Mr. BUTLER. The gentleman means to continue the session until we reach that point?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BUTLER. And then the gentleman will move to rise?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. With the understanding that we will meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] shakes his head.

Mr. WALSH. That was not in the agreement.

Mr. GARNER. The gentleman from Tennessee told me that if we rise now or at the end of this reading we could meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow; otherwise some one would make the point of no quorum and we would have to call the roll and stay here until late. It seems to me that if we rise now we ought to be able to meet at 11 to-morrow.

Mr. BUTLER. If the gentleman would move to rise now, it would be agreeable to me.

Mr. STAFFORD. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] will not object to our meeting at 11 o'clock if we finish this page.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase and manufacture of smokeless powder, \$2,500,000.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee in regard to this item. It seems to me rather a large item, in view of what must have taken place in the Navy. Surely, during a year and a half of war there must have been a considerable manufacture and accumulation of smokeless powder.

Mr. PADGETT. The Navy has a supply of smokeless powder, but not a large surplus. This is simply enough to keep the powder factory at Indianhead running during the year on one shift a day. That is all we put in for that purpose.

Mr. TILSON. Does the gentleman say that the Navy has not a considerable surplus of smokeless powder?

Mr. PADGETT. They say not.

Mr. TILSON. It seems that the Army has a very large surplus of explosives. It is said that the Army has on hand 100,-

000,000 pounds of TNT, and that there is talk of dumping it into the ocean.

Mr. PADGETT. That was a different kind.

Mr. TILSON. I understand.

Mr. PADGETT. This is for big guns.

Mr. TILSON. I understand, of course, that it is a different explosive from the other.

Mr. PADGETT. This is only to keep the factory running one shift a day instead of three, as it was running during the war.

Mr. TILSON. So it takes two and a half million dollars a year just to keep the smokeless-powder factory running?

Mr. PADGETT. To keep up the supply, and then this will not more than keep it up for the needs they will have.

Mr. TILSON. Even in peace times?

Mr. PADGETT. No, sir.

Mr. TILSON. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Torpedoes and appliances: For the purchase and manufacture of torpedoes and appliances, to be available until June 30, 1922, \$1,000,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the paragraph. As I understand it there was \$10,000,000 appropriated in this item last year to be available until June 30, 1921. Now, you propose to appropriate \$1,000,000 to be available until June 30, 1922. What is the reason for having this appropriation continue available so many years in advance of the expiration of the life of the bill?

Mr. PADGETT. It is only two years. It has been carried that way for years for the simple reason that in the manufacture of torpedoes they can not always figure they will get their machinery and parts together and complete them within a year, and Congress has always allowed this to run for two years. The other one was for 1921, and before that it was made to 1920, and this is just as it has been for a number of years without any change of policy or plan.

Mr. STAFFORD. I withdraw the reservation of the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent, Bureau of Ordnance: For miscellaneous items, namely, cartage, expenses of light and water at ammunition depots and stations, tolls, ferrage, technical books, and incidental expenses attending inspection of ordnance material, \$25,000.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and Mr. FOSTER having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 15539, and had come to no resolution thereon.

HOOR OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does the gentleman expect, by meeting at 11 o'clock to-morrow and sitting late, to finish this bill to-morrow night?

Mr. PADGETT. I am hoping to finish the bill without having to sit late.

Mr. WALSH. I suppose that perhaps the gentleman's hopes and expectations are the same, but I am asking him if he expects to sit to-morrow evening late enough to finish this bill providing he did not finish it by 2 o'clock or 3 o'clock or 4 o'clock in the afternoon?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes; I would sit until—

Mr. BUTLER. The chairman has accepted an invitation from me to-morrow night, and I am going to hold him to it. I only wish I could invite you all.

Mr. PADGETT. I would say at least until 7 o'clock, anyway.

Mr. BUTLER. So we can be at the place by 8 o'clock.

Mr. PADGETT. I would be glad if the gentleman could fix the arrangement for 9 o'clock, so as to let us have a little leeway.

Mr. BUTLER. No—

Mr. PADGETT. Say 7 o'clock to-morrow night.

Mr. BUTLER. I am much obliged to the gentleman.

Mr. WALSH. Whether the bill is finished or not?

Mr. PADGETT. Of course it will not run after 7 o'clock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 7, 1919, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of War submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation required for purchase of additional land at Walter Reed Hospital, District of Columbia (H. Doc. 1766); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers submitting abstracts of proposals received during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918 (H. Doc. No. 1767); to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department and ordered to be printed.

3. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report of proceedings to date in determining value and advisability of purchase of the Cape Cod Canal, connecting Buzzards Bay and Cape Cod Bay (H. Doc. No. 1768); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

4. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of communication from the Secretary of War, submitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required by the War Department for armament of fortifications and fortifications of insular possessions (H. Doc. No. 1769); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the acting chairman of the United States Shipping Board submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation required by the Shipping Board for expenditures heretofore authorized in connection with the purchase, requisition, etc., of plants, materials, ships, etc., and for the recruiting, instructing, and training of officers and crews of American vessels, fiscal year 1919 (H. Doc. No. 1770); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6. A letter from the chairman of the Public Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia, transmitting reports from the Washington Market Co. and the Union Transfer Co., and affidavits from other public utilities that they are unable to furnish the required report within the time fixed by law (H. Doc. No. 1771); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. ASHBROOK, from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15495) to amend an act to provide for the appointment of a commission to standardize screw threads, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1041), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. DELANEY, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 15706) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1038), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOBECK, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6451) for the relief of Martin Goldsmith, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1039), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GARRETT of Texas, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 175) to correct an error in the wording of the appropriation of \$71,000 made in the act approved July 9, 1918, and to authorize

the Secretary of War to pay said sum to respective parties entitled thereto, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1040), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GREEN of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 15681) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Audubon, county of Audubon, State of Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15682) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Glenwood, county of Mills, State of Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15683) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Elk Horn, county of Shelby, State of Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15684) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Atlantic, county of Cass, State of Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15685) donating two captured German cannon or field guns and carriages to the city of Council Bluffs, Pottawattamie County, State of Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15686) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Red Oak, county of Montgomery, State of Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15687) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the city of Guthrie Center, county of Guthrie, State of Iowa; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCULLOCH: A bill (H. R. 15688) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the Boy Scouts of the city of Newcomers-town, Ohio; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 15689) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Cherokee, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15690) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Baxter Springs, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOMINICK: A bill (H. R. 15691) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Belton, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15692) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building, courthouse, and other Government offices at Greenwood, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15693) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building, courthouse, and other Government offices at Anderson, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15694) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Williamston, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15695) for the purchase of a site and for the erection of a post-office building at Pelzer, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15696) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Piedmont, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15697) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Seneca, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15698) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at McCormick, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15699) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Westminster, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15700) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Honea Path, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15701) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Pickens, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15702) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Easley, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15703) for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a post-office building at Walhalla, S. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15704) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Belton, S. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece and carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15705) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Honea Path, S. C., one German cannon or fieldpiece with carriage; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 15707) granting the consent of Congress to the construction of a bridge across the Roanoke River at or near Williamston, Martin County, N. C.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEDMAN: A bill (H. R. 15708) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a public building at Mount Airy, N. C.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 15709) directing the Secretary of the Navy to grant honorable discharges to enlisted men of the Navy for certain reasons; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15710) directing the Secretary of War to grant honorable discharges to enlisted or drafted men in the Army for certain reasons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 15711) to amend an act entitled "An act to save daylight and to provide standard time for the United States," approved March 19, 1918; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McKEOWN: A bill (H. R. 15712) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Okemah, Okfuskee County, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15713) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Lehigh, Coal County, State of Oklahoma, one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15714) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Holdenville, Hughes County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15715) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Coalgate, Coal County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15716) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wetumka, Hughes County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15717) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wewoka, Seminole County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15718) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Seminole, Seminole County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15719) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Shawnee, Pottawatomie County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15720) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Drumright, Creek County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15721) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tecumseh, Pottawatomie County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15722) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chandler, Lincoln County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15723) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Prague, Lincoln County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15724) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Sapulpa, Creek County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15725) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bristow, Creek County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15726) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Tishomingo, Johnston County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15727) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Welletka, Okfuskee County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15728) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Ada, Pontotoc County, Okla., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 15729) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Oakwood Township High School, Catlin, Ill., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WISE: A bill (H. R. 15730) to enlarge and make additions to and further improve the post-office building at Macon, Ga.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 15731) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Lewisburg, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15732) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Newport, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15733) for the purchase of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Waynesboro, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15734) increasing the limit of cost for a Federal building at Lewistown, Pa.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GLYNN: A bill (H. R. 15735) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the town of Naugatuck, Conn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15736) to donate a captured cannon or gun to the city of Derby, Conn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DONOVAN: A bill (H. R. 15742) to regulate the collection and expenditure of money, other than by the Government of the United States or by its authority, for the use and benefit of the armed forces of the United States and of its allies, and especially of France, Great Britain, Italy, Belgium, Serbia, Greece, and Montenegro, or for any auxiliary organizations of said Governments maintained and operated for the use and benefit of such armed forces; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 15743) to allow credits and provide relief for certain persons not now provided for by law; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHELAN: Resolution (H. Res. 554) for the consideration of Senate bill 5236; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CARLIN: Resolution (H. Res. 555) authorizing the Clerk of the House to pay Allison C. Jenkins, brother of Laura A. Blincoe, late an employee of the House of Representatives, six months' salary; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. EMERSON: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 405) directing the War Department to commission all soldiers who took the course of study to prepare themselves for a commission in France; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DOMINICK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 406) granting to certain persons in the military or naval forces an extension of automatic insurance provided for in section 401 of the war-risk insurance act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SABATH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 407) to establish diplomatic relations with Czecho-Slovakia and Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) recommending that the peace conference now sitting in Paris will favorably consider the right of Ireland to self-determination; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon relating to extra pay to honorably discharged soldiers and marines in the recent world war; also memorial relating to recognition of United Armenian Republic; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Alabama protesting against the Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAREW: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to records of local draft boards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, relative to regulating the construction of dams across navigable waters, and to provide for the improvement and development of waterways for the use of interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EVANS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, favoring the passage of an act ceding to the State of Montana the military reservation located in Montana, known as Fort William Henry Harrison, to be used as an adjunct of the

State industrial accident board for a rehabilitation institute for the education and maintenance of persons injured in the industries of Montana; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. McARTHUR: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon favoring legislation that will grant to the State of Oregon two large German cannons, captured in engagements in which Oregon soldiers were engaged, to be placed upon the capitol grounds at Salem; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon favoring an appropriation for the finishing of steel and wooden ships under contract; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon asking the United States to assist in every way possible to help the cause of an United Armenian Republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial from the Legislature of the State of Oregon favoring the payment of six months' salary to every honorably discharge soldier, sailor, and marine; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER: Memorial from the Legislature of the State of Illinois, favoring extra pay and employment for discharged soldiers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois requesting the Federal Government to pay at least six months' salary to every soldier, sailor, and marine upon his return to civil life; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging the enactment of legislation to grant three months' extra pay to soldiers and sailors who have served in the war with the German Imperial Government; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging the prompt enactment of Senate bill 2130, relating to increase of pensions in certain cases; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Minnesota, urging the immediate demobilization of the military forces enlisted for the period of the war and the establishment of a regular military force; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DELANEY: A bill (H. R. 15706) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 15737) granting an increase of pension to Diadem Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRIE of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 15738) granting a pension to Emeline Burley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FOSTER: A bill (H. R. 15739) granting a pension to Eva O. Hall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 15740) granting an increase of pension to John T. Maloney, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 15741) granting a promotion to Robert M. Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CARY: Petition of mayor and common council of Milwaukee, Wis., urging Congress to enact such legislation as will eliminate unemployment by reducing hours of labor and fixing minimum wage scales and inaugurating a system of public work; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of common council of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., indorsing movement to pay soldiers and sailors their salaries for certain period after their discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of Irish nationalists of Cleveland, Ohio, relating to the self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of Clarence H. Mackay, president of the Postal Telegraph Co., protesting against Government control of wire system and asking that lines be turned back to

their respective companies at once; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of mass meeting of parents and citizens in Powell School and District of Columbia urging Congress to take immediate action on appropriation bill now pending in Senate as will increase salaries of teachers in public schools 100 per cent; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. GREGG: Petition of residents of Palestine, Texas City, and Crockett, Tex., asking for repeal of postal zone rate bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KAHN: Memorial of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, urging restoration of powers of Interstate Commerce Commission to suspend rates and indorsing Senate bill 5020; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce urging legislation for Roosevelt National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Dr. and Mrs. Frederick S. Gould, Santa Barbara, Cal., urging favorable consideration of Lewis-Raker bill, conferring military rank upon Army nurses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island: Resolution of Connecticut Legislature, urging that principle of self-determination be applied to all small nations, including Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, resolution of Friendly Sons of St. Patrick of Cranston, R. I., urging passage of legislation respecting self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of certain residents of Hartford County, Conn., protesting against the luxury-tax provisions in pending revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of citizens of Hartford, Conn., for providing labor, etc., for honorably discharged men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce, New Haven, Conn., favoring establishment of league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McFADDEN: Petition of Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, Lodge No. 904, Sayre, Pa., favoring Government ownership of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORIN: Petition of members of Keystone Council, No. 50, Daughters of America, McKeesport, Pa., Mrs. Annie Townsend, secretary, urging passage of Senate bill 5139; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Woodrow Lodge, No. 1038, I. A. of M., Pitscairn, Pa., urging Government control of all railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Pennsylvania Confectioners' Association of Pittsburgh, Pa., urging that the revenue act of October 3, 1917, remain in force, thus making the passage of the pending revenue act unnecessary; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Retail Merchants' Association of Pittsburgh, Pa., W. M. Jacoby, secretary, protesting against retention of the luxury taxes in the revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of Fred C. Ray and other citizens of Hallowell, Me., for national ownership and Government management of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of certain citizens of Uno, Cal., asking for repeal of postal zone law; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of women's committee of the California State Council of National Defense, relating to reconstruction problems and policies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Baldemann Chocolate Co., of San Francisco, Cal., protesting against the proposed revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Santa Barbara (Cal.) Nurses' Association, indorsing the conferring of rank on Army nurses, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Federal Employees Union, No. 1, San Francisco, Cal., urging increased compensation for Government employees; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Mississippi Valley Waterways Association, urging upon Congress the development of inland waterways; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of R. H. Alcorn, chairman, indorsing the Keating retirement bill (H. R. 12352); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of New York Produce Exchange, urging the discontinuance of price-fixing and control of foodstuffs by the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Western Fruit Jobbers' Association of America, urging the return of Federal-controlled utilities to private ownership; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Union Hardware Co., of Los Angeles, Cal., against the proposed tax of 10 per cent on arms and ammunition; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, requesting Congress to repeal the provisions of the Federal-control act and indorsing Senate bill 5020; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Collins McArthur Candy Co., of San Francisco, Cal., urging against passage of the pending revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of Executive Committee, California Teachers' Association, Central Section, favoring creation of a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Memorial of Baudette Board of Trade, Baudette, Minn., in support of the proposition to provide deeper waterways connection via the St. Lawrence River to the Atlantic; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

Also, memorial of Brainerd Chamber of Commerce, Brainerd, Minn., in support of the proposition to provide deeper waterways connection via the St. Lawrence River to the Atlantic; to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of Blennerhassett Lodge, No. 699, Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, Parkersburg, W. Va., relative to control of railroads by the Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 7, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, with the duties pressing upon us, with the divine call ringing in our hearts for the advance of the interests of Thy people, with the solemn sense of our responsibility to Thee and to our fellow citizens, we begin the service of this day. As we lift our hearts to Thee, as we open them to Thy presence, we pray, Thee to fill us with Thy divine spirit that we may properly discern between the right and the wrong, that we may lead as Thou dost lead us, that we may commit ourselves and our Nation solely to Thy purpose. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when on request of Mr. KING and by unanimous consent the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

SENATOR FROM ILLINOIS.

Mr. SHERMAN. I present the credentials of Hon. MEDILL McCORMICK, duly elected by the people of the State of Illinois a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1919, which I ask to have read and placed on the files.

The credentials were read and ordered to be placed on the files, as follows:

TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES:

This is to certify that on the 5th day of November, 1918, Hon. MEDILL McCORMICK was duly elected by the people of the State of Illinois a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States for the term of six years beginning on the 4th day of March, 1919.

Witness: His excellency, our governor, Frank O. Lowden, and our seal hereto affixed at Springfield, this 5th day of February, A. D. 1919.

By the governor:
[SEAL.]

LOUIS L. EMMERSON,
Secretary of State.

TRIALS BY COURTS-MARTIAL (S. DOC. NO. 380).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, in response to a Senate resolution, which will be inserted in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

The communication is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, February 4, 1919.

THE HONORABLE THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Senate resolution of January 27, 1919, which directs the Secretary of War "to send to the Senate the number of individuals who have been tried and convicted by court-martial proceedings since our entrance into the war, April 6, 1917, together with a brief statement of the offense charged and the nature and extent of the punishment inflicted upon or assessed against each."